

Desk

RECEIVED ROOM
LIBRARY
OFFICE OF THE
SECRETARY OF STATE

Department of State

bulletin

VOL. XXII, No. 529

March 22, 1940

GENERAL EDITION OF THE DOCUMENTS TO STRENGTHEN U.S.
TIES WITH THE HUMAN PEOPLES • *Continued*
The American People 47

THE HUMAN PEOPLES OF THE AMERICAN CONTINENT •
The American People 49

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE PERMITS TO
STRENGTHEN TIES WITH THE HUMAN PEOPLES 49





The Department of State bulletin

VOL. XXII, No. 559 • PUBLICATION 3795

March 20, 1950

The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication compiled and edited in the Division of Publications, Office of Public Affairs, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes press releases on foreign policy issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest.

Publications of the Department, as well as legislative material in the field of international relations, are listed currently.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

PRICE:
52 issues, domestic \$6, foreign \$8.50
Single copy, 20 cents

The printing of this publication has been approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (February 18, 1949).

Note: Contents of this publication are not copyrighted and items contained herein may be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be appreciated.

Apr 6 1950

"TOTAL DIPLOMACY" TO STRENGTHEN U.S. LEADERSHIP FOR HUMAN FREEDOM

Remarks by Secretary Acheson¹

I would like to talk to you about the need today for "total diplomacy." A few years ago, we in this country were fully acquainted with the phrase "total war" and with the implications of that phrase. We knew that we were engaged in a life and death struggle with a powerful foe and that if we were to be successful in that struggle we would have to marshal all of the resources of the country. It was not sufficient merely to turn the problem over to the Department of Defense or to any other branch of the Government and expect that we could succeed. It was necessary for each of us to play our assigned role in our common defense, to establish controls of the most far-reaching sort, and, in other ways, to make sure that all of the forces of the country were directed in the most efficient manner possible to the winning of the war.

Today, we are engaged in a struggle—that is the word to describe it—that is just as crucial from the point of view of the continued existence of our way of life, but we clearly are not focusing our total resources on the winning of that struggle.

For one thing, we have never taken the general activities of our country—which mean governmental activities—as seriously as we should in times of peace. We have regarded them with a good-natured tolerance expressed in the phrase, "Well, politics is politics." We have thought of politics as a legitimate field for trying to promote special interests. There is a tendency to shrug our shoulders over governmental shortcomings and faults. Moreover, while we have recognized

that there were foreign claims upon us which our self-interest demanded that we attend to, we have not thought of them as being in the same category of importance as our own domestic business.

Then, too, it has been hard for us to convince ourselves that human nature is not pretty much the same the world over. We hear it said that if we could only get Harry Truman to "get his feet under the same table"—that is the phrase used—with Joe Stalin, we would be able to iron out any international difficulty. Our own experience with people in our own communities has been such that it has seemed to us that good intentions must, in the long run, prevail—and if one proposition didn't meet with acceptance, all we had to do was to think up a better one.

There has been an attitude on the part of some that if things went too far we might have to "call their bluff" and possibly have a show-down.

In brief, we have felt that, somehow or other, there was an answer to our problem if only we were smart enough to figure it out.

Create Situations of Strength

We must realize, however, that the world situation is not one to which there is an easy answer. The only way to deal with the Soviet Union, we have found from hard experience, is to create situations of strength. Wherever the Soviet detects weakness or disunity—and it is quick to detect them—it exploits them to the full. A "show-down," in the brutal and realistic sense, of resort to a military decision is not a possible policy for a democracy. The Kremlin knows that.

We are struggling against an adversary that is deadly serious. We are in a situation where we

¹ Summary of remarks made at a meeting of the Advertising Council at the White House on Feb. 16, 1950, and released to the press on Mar. 9, 1950. These remarks will be printed as Department of State publication 3806.

are playing for keeps. Moreover, we are in a situation where we could lose without ever firing a shot.

It used to be said that the progress of imperialism was, first, to send out missionaries, then traders, and then colonial governors. But that is kid stuff compared to the methods that we are up against. There has never, in the history of the world, been an imperialist system that compares with what the Soviet Union has at its disposal. We have seen it in China. The Communists took over China at a ridiculously small cost. What they did was to invite some Chinese leaders who were dissatisfied with the way things were going in their country to come to Moscow. There, they thoroughly indoctrinated them so that they returned to China prepared to resort to any means whatsoever to establish Communist control. They were completely subservient to the Moscow regime. (It is, of course, because Tito has thrown off this subservience that the Tito development is regarded with such deadly seriousness by Moscow.) These agents then mingled among the people and sold them on the personal material advantages of communism. They talked to the people in their own language. They promised to turn over the land to them. (Of course, everybody knows that after the land has been turned over to them and the Communists have gotten control they immediately take the land back under a program of "collectivization.")

But the Communists don't talk only in terms of economic interest. We have all seen pictures from China of native dances out in the fields which were put on by the local Communist organization. In many cases, they provided the only fun that these peasants had, and the peasants were led to believe that the Communist organization was the only group that provided the kind of life the peasants wanted.

The arsenal of the Communists is varied. I need not describe in detail the uses which they make of force, threats, infiltration, planned chaos, despair and confusion, and the enslavement of the people they dominate by a shrewd use of informers.

Foreign Policy Designs To Meet Challenges

Against this threat we must have a foreign policy with two interrelated branches. First, we must be prepared to meet wherever possible all thrusts of the Soviet Union. It will not always be possible to anticipate where these thrusts will

take place, and we will not always be able to deal with them with equal effectiveness. In the case of Greece and Turkey, we were able to meet that thrust effectively because the Greeks and the Turks were determined to maintain their independence. There were a lot of Greeks and Turks that did not like their government. There were a lot that did. But they were united in a common belief that they preferred it to any form of government that might be imposed upon them from outside. The Greeks were able, with our assistance, to meet military force with military force. The Turks have successfully resisted the powerful Soviet pressure brought against them. It should be borne in mind that in this case we were not dealing with threats to Greece and Turkey alone. The thrust that the Soviet Union was making in this case was directed at domination of the entire Near East and, then, at all of Europe.

It has been suggested by some people that the Greek and Turkish Governments were not our kind of democracy and therefore we should not have given them our aid. Of course, they do not have exactly the same kind of institutions that we do. But we are not dealing here with the kind of situation where we can go from one country to another with a piece of litmus paper and see whether everything is true blue, whether the political, economic, and social climate is exactly, in all its details, the kind that we would like to have either for them or for us. The only question that we should ask is whether they are determined to protect their independence against Communist aggression and if they are, we should recognize our basic unity with them on this point.

In the case of China, the Communist thrust succeeded because the Chinese people were not convinced that the National Government was concerned with their welfare. I do not think that this thrust could have been prevented so long as the Chinese people felt that we were supporting a government that they did not believe to be serving their interest.

The second part of our foreign policy must be to create those economic, political, social, and psychological conditions that strengthen and create confidence in the democratic way of life. In Indonesia, for instance, we have been trying to make it plain to the Indonesians that we are sympathetic with their aspirations for independence. They do not want to be ruled by the Dutch or by the Russians or by anyone else. They want

to rule themselves. If we are to establish a solidarity with them, we must have Americans living among them who talk their language—I mean literally talk the Indonesian language—who understand them and are understood by them. We must do what we can to help them make the most of their natural resources. We do this not by building elaborate plants but by such things as enabling the Indonesian farmers to help themselves, to have better tools, and to use better methods than they have known before. We must see their problems from their point of view. We must help them, so far as we can, to reach their own goals.

Developing Economy Measures

In areas like Western Europe where there is a fully developed modern industrial economy, we must help the countries to take the measures that are necessary to put that economy on a sound basis.

One of the things that we must do is to enable other countries to buy with their own products the raw materials that they need to feed and clothe and employ their own people. This means that we must buy their goods and their services to a greater extent than at present. It is a matter of judgment as to what the level of our trade with the rest of the world should be, but probably it should be somewhere not very far from present levels. We must take that kind of action even though it requires adjustments here at home—and it will require some adjustments. Make no mistake about it, if we want to have strong allies in Europe, we have got to work out some kind of pattern of this kind. That will mean that European goods will compete with American goods and some American industries are likely to suffer. If this should prove to be the case, then means must be found to take care of any resulting adjustments.

Self-discipline

We are going to need self-discipline in what we say and do. What we say and do has tremendous importance in strengthening or weakening this country's leadership.

It is, of course, extremely difficult to get democracies to work together. The democratic approach, by its very nature, is a varied approach. It embodies freedom of action and freedom of decision, but if we are to win against a power that has imposed complete unity on all of its members,

we shall have to achieve, in our own way and by common determination, some unity of our own.

When we have reached unity and determination on the part of the free nations—when we have eliminated all of the areas of weakness that we can—we will be able to evolve working agreements with the Russians. We will not have to keep our ears to the ground in order to know when the Russians are prepared to recognize that they cannot exploit a situation to their own benefit. In the case of Berlin, when they realized that the airlift had prevented them from ousting the allies, we had no difficulty in learning when they came to that conclusion. Marshal Stalin announced it to the world in his answers to the Kingsbury Smith questions. Similar questions had been on file in the Kremlin for months. They have drawers full of questions there today that they can haul out and answer whenever they realize that it is to their interest to do so.

No good would come from our taking the initiative in calling for conversations at this point. Such an effort on our part would raise false hopes among some people and fears among others. The Russians would know that there was a public expectancy of results of some kind, and those results could only be achieved by dangerous concessions on our part. Only the Russians would benefit from such a step.

The Russians know that we are ready, always have been ready, always will be ready, to discuss with them any outstanding issue. We have discussed with them all important outstanding issues, not once, but many times. It is clear that the Russians do not want to settle those issues as long as they feel there is any possibility they can exploit them for their own objectives of world domination. It is only when they come to the conclusion that they cannot so exploit them that they will make agreements and they will let it be known when they have reached that decision.

Meaning of "Total Diplomacy"

These are some of the things that I meant when I referred to "total diplomacy." It means that all branches of the government must work closely together. Congress and the Departments of Defense, Treasury, Agriculture, and Commerce, and Interior Department, with its responsibility for our national resources, and the others, all have roles to play that are just as important in our re-

lations with other people as the role of the Department of State.

And so it is with business, agriculture, and labor, with the press and with the radio, with all of our great national organizations. We must agree voluntarily to concert our efforts to this one overriding task. If we do that, there can be little doubt that we shall succeed. The non-Communist countries together have two-thirds of the world's population, three-fourths of the world's economic

productive power, and a potential preponderance of the world's military power. They have the highest standard of living and the greatest ability to help underdeveloped areas achieve higher standards of living. They have on their side the appeal of independence and of national loyalties. They have the greatest attraction of all—human freedom. With these forces on our side, provided we use them well and wisely, the chances of victory and of peace are good.

SOVIET ISOLATION OF THE RUSSIAN PEOPLES

by Foy D. Kohler, Chief, Division of International Broadcasting

When I went to Moscow, at the beginning of 1947, a certain aura of our wartime alliance with the Soviet Union still prevailed. We were able to see some Russians in a reasonably friendly atmosphere, but during my stay, the deliberate intent and actions of the Soviet regime reversed this situation almost entirely. The Soviet press, in 1949, would lead one to believe that during the past war we had been the enemies and not the allies of the Soviet Union. The only Russians we were permitted to see were those who worked for us as language teachers, domestic servants, or laborers. They simultaneously kept close tab on us for the MVD. From time to time, we also saw Soviet officials and had the pleasure of talking with them, quite calmly but unproductively, mostly about such important matters as the local weather and our knowledge of languages.

The Soviet Government's internal propaganda campaign, one regrets to say, is beginning to have some effect on the Russian people, along the lines desired. The extent to which the regime has gone in isolating the Russians from any foreign contacts and in keeping from them any news from abroad is beyond the imagination of any American who has not actually witnessed the situation with his own eyes. No Soviet citizen is permitted to travel abroad. No Soviet citizen is allowed to marry a foreigner. Few foreigners are permitted to enter the country: those who are permitted to enter are either foreign officials or Communist stooges. The foreign officials are restricted in

their movements and constantly spied upon. Even the foreign Communists are kept well in hand. It is against the law for Russians and Russian institutions to have any dealings with foreigners. A Russian practically never sees a foreign publication. The last important chink in the iron curtain was the Russian radio programs of the Voice of America and the British Broadcasting Company. It is now clear that they must have been listened to by many millions of Russians. At the moment, both our own and the British programs are largely cut off by a colossal jamming effort on the part of the Soviet regime.

The Differences of Heritage

An American is bound to ask himself why the Russian people tolerate such control of their lives or a regime which imposes such control. The answer lies, I believe, in the wholly different history, social practices, and traditions of the Russian people which have retarded them in their development and set them apart from Western civilization. They have never really known anything much different than they have today. While the Western world was progressing under the stimuli of the Renaissance, the Reformation, the Age of Discovery, and, finally, of the Industrial Revolution, the Russian peoples were held in a condition of ignorance and social and economic slavery under the Tsarist autocracy.

We take for granted—indeed we are scarcely conscious of what these great historical develop-

ments mean in terms of our own character formation, development and general mental outlook. Only an historian can fully appreciate what this influence means in terms both of the qualities which we acquire in the educative process beginning from the cradle—and of the qualities which the Russians lack. We do not pause to consider that our respect for the individual and our idea of the State as his servant come to us from classical Greece and Rome; that our ethical concepts are based largely upon the recorded experience of our ancient and advanced civilization in the Holy Land which has been incorporated in the teachings of our dominant religion; or that our sense of honorable and chivalrous competition derives from the gallant exploits of the Crusades. We acquire these concepts automatically through the stories our mothers and our teachers tell us and through our youthful reading of the stories of the Greek heroes and of King Arthur and the Knights of the Round Table.

We do not pause to consider that our traditions of individual initiative and independence stem from the Age of Discovery and from the exploration and settlement of the world's frontiers. We simply inherit this outlook and consider it quite natural that our Constitution contains provisions protecting the rights, the legitimate activities, and the property of the individual.

While all these fundamental developments were taking place in the outside world, the Russians tilled lands that they did not own, were permanently attached to the soil, not allowed to move, and isolated from the outside world. The same situation is practically true today. The hopes and enthusiasm of some of the really progressive early Russian revolutionaries have long since disappeared. Marx has been Sovietized. I would even say that the best book I have read about the Soviet Union is one written 110 years ago by a French count who travelled in the country and described the life of Tsarist Russia of that time.

Le Marquis de Custine's Appraisal of Russia

I cannot forbear quoting—Le Marquis de Custine. One will note how parallel a few passages from this author are to many of the remarks above:

"Russia is a country where the government speaks as it wants, for only the government has the right to speak."

"The Russian government is the substitution of

the discipline of the camp for the social order; it is a state of war become the normal state of society."

"The Russians see in Europe a prize which will be delivered to them, sooner or later, by our dissensions; they foment anarchy in our country in the hope of being able to profit thereby."

"The Russian despotism not only counts ideas and sentiments for nothing, but it remakes facts themselves, it fights against the evidence and wins the fight. For the evidence has no defender in Russia, nor does justice, if they embarrass the ruler."

Reaching the Russians

The Russians are a virile and imaginative people. They have natural talents which could constitute a fine contribution to the world's culture. No doubt, they are entirely capable of—and would incline to—developing naturally like the rest of us if they ever have the chance. But I must add in the same breath that as long as they remained unnaturally isolated, duped, fooled, and misinformed by dictatorial rulers, they will remain a menace to all the rest of us. This fact is true regardless of who heads the Russian regime or even of whether that regime continues to be called Communist. We must, therefore, prevent them from throwing the world into a catastrophic disaster at the bidding of ambitious masters. We must at the same time make every effort to get through to the Russian people themselves. We must find ways to make them realize that they are isolated by their own rulers and that they are not getting the truth from those rulers. We must find ways to make them realize that we have no hatred for them and that we do not covet their lands and their riches. We must find ways to make them realize that we would welcome them into the family of nations on a truly equal and friendly basis.

We can do little about Soviet internal restrictions, but we can win the radio battle. We have already taken the countermeasures that are possible with the present facilities and personnel of the Voice. We have, undoubtedly, lost our great Russian mass audience for the time being but we have reason to believe that, thanks to our mass transmissions in cooperation with BBC and our round-the-clock broadcasting schedule, we are still reaching a hard core of Russian listeners.

Millions of people have such a personal lot in the Soviet Union as to make them disaffected to

the regime, and Russians are naturally a child-like and primitive people who have only to be forbidden a cookie jar to make them develop a great appetite for sweets.

The Congress appreciates that radio is the only means by which we can hope to surmount the barriers of Soviet chauvinism and censorship. It has just voted a special fund of nearly 12 million dollars to help us get over the barrier of jamming. We shall spend this money carefully and wisely for the purpose intended. The facilities available to the Voice of America—I would like to say the Voice of the American people—will be greatly expanded. With these additional facilities we hope to recapture our mass audience in the Soviet Union. When we do, we shall try to tell them the things of which I have just spoken and which I am sure represent the convictions of every one in this country.

The Soviet Government will oppose all of our efforts in this direction; its very life is largely dependent on keeping the Russian people in a state of isolation and ignorance of the outside world. It must continue to try to persuade them that they are menaced from abroad.

Need for American Leadership

As I see it, we need have no shooting war with the Soviet Union so long as we remain reasonably prepared, united with our friends in the rest of the world, and in a good state of social and economic health inside our own country. But we must do these things for an indefinite period. We must keep our insurance policies permanently up to date. The problems of our relations with the Russians are not questions of this year or next year, or 5 years, or 10 years. They are the questions of the future of humanity. They are the

task of this generation, of the next generation, and possibly of many more generations to come.

Now what does all this mean to all of us? It means that the fate of the people of this country for a long time to come will be more intimately related to foreign affairs than ever before. It means that American citizens must be more conscious of and better informed regarding the state of the world than ever before in our history. It means that we must be able to support a program of military preparedness and of close relations with like-minded peoples in the world on an unprecedented scale. It means that our leadership must be wise and capable as never before. Only if these conditions are met can our foreign policy be conducted on a basis of strength and determination, with the support of an active, informed public opinion essential under our system of government.

These, then are the tasks before us as Americans. They require patience, persistence, and determination to a degree heretofore considered beyond the capacity of real democracies. They require calm and cool judgment. They require constant efforts to perfect our own democracy and to make life ever better for free men everywhere.

I should like to call again on the French Marquis. "If ever your son becomes dissatisfied in France," he said, "use my recipe: say to him, 'Go to Russia.' This is a most useful journey; for whoever sees Russia will be content to live anywhere else. It is always good to know that there exists a society in which happiness is impossible because, by a law of his nature, man cannot be happy without being free." I would add that this would be good for the Russians, as well as ourselves, to know. The Voice of America will do everything in its power to see that they eventually do.

Soviet Refusal To Grant Exit Permits to American Citizens in the U.S.S.R.

UNSATISFACTORY POSITION OF THE SOVIET UNION

[Released to the press March 3]

The Embassy at Moscow on December 12, 1949, presented an *aide-memoire* to the Soviet Foreign Office recapitulating the Embassy's representations over a period of years with regard to the position of persons of known or presumed American citizenship unable to depart from the Soviet Union. In the absence of any reply from the Soviet Foreign Office, a copy of the December 12 communication was handed to the Soviet Ambassador at Washington on January 18, 1950, with the request that he expedite a reply.

On February 28, 1950, the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs presented an *aide-memoire* to our Embassy at Moscow in reply to our representations. This reply, however, cannot in any way be considered to be an adequate response to the numerous and repeated representations made by the Embassy.

The Embassy's communication of December 12, 1949, cited particular cases of individuals to illustrate the situation of whole groups of American citizens in the Soviet Union estimated to total 2,000 persons. The Soviet Government has chosen, as is often the case, to make reply regarding the cases of the individuals named, ignoring the very much larger number of directly parallel cases.

As is pointed out in the Embassy's communication, there is considerable evidence that repressive measures have been taken by Soviet authorities against American citizens attempting to arrange for departure from the Soviet Union. It is obvious, therefore, why the Embassy employed the device of using illustrative examples.

In comparing the American and Soviet communications, it will be noted that of the 13 American citizens documented by the Soviet Government as stateless persons or foreigners residing in the U.S.S.R., only one has been granted permission to depart. Of the 20 American citizens who are considered to have been erroneously declared to be Soviet citizens by the Soviet Government, only three have been permitted to depart. Of the ap-

proximately 2,000 persons having claim to American citizenship, including minor children unable to join surviving parents now residing in the United States and women who are being kept apart from husbands or children also now living in the United States, only one woman has been granted departure permission. Of the 32 United States citizens detained at forced labor, 23 have been allowed to depart for Eastern European countries, but there is no indication that they will be permitted to proceed to the United States.

The very fact that it is necessary for this Government to estimate the total number of American citizens in the Soviet Union brings out the difficulties with which the Embassy is confronted in attempting to fulfill its normal functions with regard to American citizens.

As is pointed out in the Embassy's communication, Embassy officials are precluded from visiting American citizens residing in that great portion of the Soviet Union which has been designated as "forbidden zones." Mail communications have been interfered with by Soviet authorities, and numbers of American citizens have been denied permission to travel to Moscow in order to visit the Embassy.

This Government is, of course, pleased that the Soviet Government has agreed to grant permission to depart from the U.S.S.R. to five American citizens. It is also agreeable to learn that, after periods of detention averaging over 5 years, 23 American inmates of labor camps who are considered by the U.S.S.R. to be citizens of third powers have left the Soviet Union. We cannot be satisfied, however, before all of those 23 who so desire are granted permission, whoever they may be, to return to the United States.

As regards the Soviet denial that American citizens have been held at forced labor, it is sufficient to state, without citing the names of the persons involved, that the relatives of some of them have received letters from the individuals in labor camps bearing return addresses of labor camps and in some cases citing certain of the conditions which exist in these camps.

In its reply, the Soviet Government states that the "decision of the question concerning the

citizenship of Soviet citizens is the exclusive concern of Soviet authorities." Nonetheless, in the same paragraph, it arrogates to itself the right to determine who is and who is not an American citizen.

This Government cannot accept the assertion of the Soviet Government that it has the right to pass upon the American citizenship status of persons recognized by this Government to be American citizens.

The Soviet Government's reference to illegal and forcible retention in the American zones of occupation of Soviet citizens is an oft-repeated charge based on the unwillingness of this Government to effect the forced repatriation to the Soviet Union of displaced persons unwilling to return to their prewar homes.

The Cholokian children who are alleged to have been held in the United States by "unlawful actions taken by the American authorities" have in fact been protected from forced transfer to the Soviet Union through normal American judicial process. It does not seem to be comprehensible to the Soviet authorities that the executive branch of this Government does not and cannot influence the decisions of the judiciary.

As regards Paul Butko, who is alleged to have been retained in prison in the United States for 7 months in violation of a Soviet-American agreement of 1933, the facts show that Butko, who had arrived as a seaman, overstayed his permitted time in the United States and was apprehended for deportation. He brought habeas corpus proceedings. In the normal course of events, a hearing was set. On application of his lawyer, Butko was granted permission to depart voluntarily from the United States and he departed on a Soviet vessel in accordance with his wish.

In this regard, it is perhaps illuminating to note that the Soviet Government has failed to inform the American Embassy in Moscow of the detention at forced labor of any of the 32 American citizens specifically referred to in the Embassy's *aide-mémoire* of December 12, 1949.

Despite the unsatisfactory nature of the Soviet Government's reply to our representations, the United States Embassy at Moscow will, of course, continue to the best of its ability its efforts to aid American citizens in the Soviet Union.

EXCHANGE OF COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN U.S. AND U.S.S.R.

No. 575

AMERICAN EMBASSY
MOSCOW, U.S.S.R.,
October 4, 1949

EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to refer to a note-verbale, no. 36 dated May 7, 1949, from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to the Embassy in connection with the release from confinement in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of various American citizens therein listed.

The records of the Embassy, as well as information received from other American diplomatic missions, indicate that, in addition to those mentioned in the note above cited, there remain in confinement in the Soviet Union another group of thirty-one American citizens, most of them women, who were transported under duress to the Soviet Union by the Soviet military forces during or shortly after the conclusion of active hostilities in Eastern Europe.

With regard to these additional thirty-one persons, whose status as American citizens is not open to question, I find that the Embassy, over a period of years, has lodged repeated representations with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. In its replies, the Ministry apparently has made much of the fact that, in many cases, these persons are of German ethnic origin, as though this alone constitutes sufficient justification for their indefinite detention in the Soviet Union against their clearly expressed will. In not one of these cases, however, is it alleged that the person concerned has borne arms or committed war crimes against the United Nations during the recent war, and, insofar as I am aware, there is no evidence whatsoever that any of them have done so. As I am sure Your Excellency will agree, an individual's ethnic origin hardly can be considered to have any bearing on his citizenship.

I feel it necessary to reiterate that the majority of the thirty-one American citizens to which I now refer are women, that they have been in the Soviet Union for several years, that they have not been afforded an opportunity to communicate with their Embassy, and that, in most cases, their closest living relatives are in the United States.

I am transmitting with this note a list of these persons, American citizens recognized as such after careful investigation on the part of my Government, who apparently are still being retained at forced labor by Your Excellency's Government. I should appreciate Your Excellency giving personal attention to the individual cases of these persons with a view to their early release and departure from the Soviet Union.

Please accept [etc.]

ALAN G. KIRK

His Excellency A. A. GROMYKO
Acting Minister for Foreign Affairs
Moscow.

December 12, 1949

The Embassy of the United States in Moscow has brought to the attention of the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs the cases of individual American citizens, and of categories of American citizens, who are being prevented by the unilateral action of the Soviet authorities from returning to their homes and families in the United States.

These repeated representations, which are a matter of record in the Embassy and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, in virtually all instances have

failed to achieve a satisfactory result. In a considerable number of instances, the Ministry has not replied to the specific and detailed notes addressed to it by the Embassy. In other cases, replies were made only after a long delay, and generally these replies passed over in silence the statements of the Embassy that the persons concerned had been documented as American citizens after careful investigation both by the Department of State of the United States and by the Embassy. By assertions and reiterations of the Soviet citizenship, whether real or alleged, of these American citizens, the Ministry ignored the wishes of the individuals concerned and disregarded such humanitarian considerations as the reunion of long-separated families. In the specific cases of certain American citizens seized in the Balkan States by the Soviet armed forces and deported to the Soviet Union, there, according to official statements of the appropriate authorities of the states in which they had been residing, to undergo forced labor, the Government of the Soviet Union implied that it has the right to control the activities of persons who, whether they are citizens of the United States, of one of the Balkan nations, or both, in any event clearly are not citizens of the Soviet Union.

The repeated failure of the Government of the Soviet Union to permit the return to the United States of American citizens was discussed, on August 5, 1947, and March 29, 1948, by Ambassador Walter B. Smith with the then Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union, A. Y. Vyshinsky. At the second of these two meetings, Ambassador Smith presented three letters which, in considerable detail, outlined the situation of American citizens detained in the Soviet Union against their clearly-expressed will. Ambassador Smith requested that these persons be permitted to depart the territory of the U.S.S.R., or that, in accordance with the established principles of international usage and with specific reference to the interchange of letters between President Roosevelt and the Commissar of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Litvinov, dated November 16, 1933, the Embassy at the very least be informed of the welfare of these citizens and, in appropriate cases, the charges on which they were being held.

The Government of the United States has patiently awaited some tangible result of these repeated representations. Unfortunately, not only has the Soviet Government failed to improve the completely unsatisfactory situation which prevailed on March 29, 1948, but the position has materially deteriorated since that date. It is a matter of record that, from April to December, 1948, only two such American citizens were granted exit permits to leave the Soviet Union, and, to the best of the Embassy's knowledge, but one member of this group of American citizens, a person having no vestige of claim to Soviet citizenship, has been granted an exit permit thus far in 1949.

Further, there exists ample evidence that, in

certain cases, repressive measures of a serious nature, including administrative fines, arrests, and discrimination with respect to employment, have been taken recently against American citizens attempting to obtain Soviet exit permits for return to the United States. Communication by mail between the Embassy and American citizens has been rendered increasingly difficult owing to the actions of local Soviet authorities, numbers of American citizens residing in outlying areas of the Soviet Union have been denied permission to visit Moscow to discuss their cases with the Embassy, and Embassy officials are precluded from visiting these persons owing to the designation by the Soviet Government of various "forbidden zones".

There are certain main categories of cases which, in the opinion of the Government of the United States, are deserving of particular attention. The first category involves certain American citizens who, despite their Soviet documentation as stateless persons or foreigners residing in the U.S.S.R. have been unable to obtain exit visas and return to the United States.

The case of George Krivenka, a native-born American citizen always documented as such, is a typical example of the attitude of the Soviet Government with regard to this type of case. Mr. Krivenka, while still a minor, had accompanied his mother to that part of Czechoslovakia later ceded to the U.S.S.R. and the outbreak of hostilities prevented their return to the United States. With the approach of Soviet forces into the Sub-Carpathian area, the Embassy prepared a list of American citizens last known to be residing in this region. This list, in which Mr. Krivenka was included, was then transmitted to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs under cover of the Embassy's note no. 243 of June 13, 1944, and the Ministry was requested to have instructions issued to the appropriate Soviet authorities with a view to assisting these citizens in contacting American military or diplomatic officers. Thus the appropriate Soviet authorities were informed of Mr. Krivenka's status as an American citizen even prior to the end of the war. By the autumn of 1946, Mr. Krivenka was able to establish contact with the Embassy and in December of that year the appropriate Soviet authorities issued him a Soviet *Vid na Zhitelstvo dlya Inostrantsa* (Residence Permit for a Foreigner). Since that time, and despite eight communications from the Embassy to the Ministry regarding his case, Mr. Krivenka has been unable to obtain permission to depart from the Soviet Union. Moreover, the Ministry has neither replied to nor even acknowledged any of the Embassy's representations concerning his repatriation.

In the case of Mrs. Adele Sagatas, an American citizen unable to join her husband who is residing in the United States, there is also illustrated a practice of local Soviet security authorities which

has come to the Embassy's attention in so many other instances that it can now only be regarded as established Soviet procedure in dealing with American citizens documented as stateless persons or foreigners residing in the U.S.S.R.; namely, to refuse permission for such citizens to journey to Moscow in order that they might discuss their cases with the Embassy and receive or have renewed their American passports.

A second category of cases involves certain other American citizens who have been declared Soviet citizens by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on grounds which, in the light of the evidence available to the Embassy, seemed illogical, arbitrary, and open to serious question. In this instance, accordingly, notes were addressed to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs presenting in detail the facts regarding these cases and the Ministry was requested to reexamine its decision in the light of such facts. In no instance has the Ministry's response been satisfactory.

Thus, in the cases of Henry Blacha and Valentina and Vladimir Kazun, minor children separate from surviving parents residing in the United States, the Ministry simply asserted that the "final decision" of the "competent Soviet authorities" was that these children were citizens of the U.S.S.R. The Ministry made no effort to outline the basis upon which the "competent" Soviet authorities arrived at this "final conclusion" or to explain the serious misstatements of fact which the Embassy brought to the Ministry's attention in its note requesting a reexamination of the citizenship status under Soviet law of these children.

Similarly, in the cases of Daniel and Fedor Nikitscheik, the Ministry merely reiterated its previous assertion that these brothers were Soviet citizens and ignored the detailed statements of the Embassy concerning their citizenship status and the circumstances surrounding their residence in that part of Poland which was initially incorporated into the U.S.S.R. in the fall of 1939. The Ministry stated that the Nikitscheik brothers were now documented with Soviet passports and "do not desire to depart from the U.S.S.R. to the United States." While, as is well known, the United States Government is resolutely opposed to the principle of forcible repatriation and has never urged American citizens to return to the United States if they did not wish to do so, the Embassy cannot help but note that in this case the Nikitscheik brothers vainly sought to obtain permission to depart from the Soviet Union for a period of over one year and that Daniel Nikitscheik, an American citizen documented with an American passport, was twice fined in the summer of 1948 by local Soviet authorities for residing without "documentation"; that is, for declining to apply for the issuance of a Soviet internal passport. In view of this type of police pressure directed against an individual whose only misdemeanor was that he desired to return to the country of his

birth and citizenship, it is an inescapable conclusion that the Nikitscheik brothers may have been compelled against their will to accept Soviet documentation.

Further, since Soviet authorities recently have consistently refused American citizens documented by the Soviet authorities themselves as persons not possessing the citizenship of the U.S.S.R. permission to come to Moscow to discuss their cases with the Embassy, and since the Nikitscheik brothers reside in an area where officers of the Embassy are expressly forbidden to travel, the Embassy has no way of confirming the wishes of these citizens as regards their repatriation and whether, in fact, they now desire to remain in the Soviet Union.

In the case of Miss Irene Berko, the Ministry has asserted that "upon her own volition" she acquired Soviet citizenship under the provisions of the agreement of July 6, 1945, between the Soviet Union and the Polish Provisional Government of National Unity and "in conformity" with the *Ukaz* of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. of November 10, 1945. The Embassy has carefully examined the provisions of the agreement on the exchange of population concluded on July 6, 1945 between the Soviet Union and the Polish Provisional Government of National Unity and it would appear indisputable that this agreement made no provision for and could not legitimately be applicable to persons possessing American citizenship. As regards the question of Miss Berko's "volition", the facts of this matter are that the residents of the Polish village in which she was then living were evacuated en masse to the Soviet Union, that upon her arrival in the U.S.S.R. she immediately registered with the chairman of the local Soviet indicating her desire to return to the United States and further that she promptly initiated correspondence with the Embassy requesting its assistance to facilitate her repatriation.

After a delay of nearly 2 years, the Ministry has recently replied to the Embassy's repeated representations concerning the case of Mr. John Jarema, an American citizen whom the Ministry had previously asserted acquired Soviet citizenship on the basis of his alleged Polish citizenship at the time of the initial annexation of Eastern Poland into the U.S.S.R. The Embassy had pressed his case since it was in possession of Mr. Jarema's Polish *Dowód Tożsamości Dla Cudzoziemca* (Card of Identity for Foreigners) issued to him on May 23, 1939, and valid at the time his place of residence was incorporated into the Soviet Union. With this documentary proof that Mr. Jarema was not considered a Polish citizen by the appropriate Polish authorities as of the date when Soviet authority was established in Eastern Poland, the Embassy requested that his case be reexamined in the light of this evidence. Further, to support its request, the Embassy transmitted

Mr. Jarema's *Dowd* to the Ministry under cover of a note dated June 3, 1948.

On June 24, 1949, the Ministry returned "the document in the name of John Jarema" and stated that, as it had already indicated the manner in which Mr. Jarema acquired Soviet citizenship, it perceived "no reasons for reexamination of the question of his citizenship."

The categories referred to above relate solely to cases involving American citizens who are not regarded by the appropriate Soviet authorities as possessing the citizenship of the U.S.S.R. or whose acquisition of Soviet citizenship appears open to serious question.

A much larger number of American citizens now residing in the Soviet Union possess the status of dual nationals; that is, while their claims to American citizenship are valid, they have also, in accordance with the provisions of various Soviet decrees, acquired the citizenship of the U.S.S.R. There are now on record with the Embassy the cases of approximately 2,000 persons who at some time since the end of the war have presented claims to American citizenship and informed the Embassy of their desire to be repatriated to the United States. Of these approximately 2,000 claimants to American citizenship, the Embassy and the Department of State have been able to verify the claims to American citizenship of 659. The claims of an additional 112 are now pending a decision by the Department of State. While the greater part of the remainder probably have valid claims to American citizenship, the Soviet Government, as indicated earlier, has rendered it impossible for the Embassy to remain in regular communication with these persons.

Article 13 of the Declaration of Human Rights approved by an overwhelming majority in the General Assembly of the United Nations contains the provision that "everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own." The United States Government holds this to be one of the most basic of human rights and deplores the unwillingness of the Soviet Government to permit persons possessing both American and Soviet citizenship to reside where they themselves desire.

In particular, there are two groups among the citizens possessing dual nationality whose continued detention in the Soviet Union can only be regarded as a gross violation of elementary humanitarian considerations and in whose cases the United States Government has directed that the Embassy make special representations to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. These groups of cases involve minor children unable to join surviving parents now residing in the United States and elderly women who are being kept apart from husbands or children also now living in the United States.

In the case of children separated from surviving parents, in most instances due to circumstance connected with the recent war and thus beyond the

control of the parents in question, the Government of the United States has always felt that the most important consideration was the humanitarian one of speedily reuniting the child with his parent or parents in the United States. Accordingly, the Embassy has repeatedly informed the Ministry that it is prepared to facilitate the travel of such children to the United States on either American or Soviet documentation and it requested the Ministry's good offices in expediting their departure from the U.S.S.R. under whatever procedure the responsible Soviet authorities might deem appropriate.

These efforts, begun in one case over 2 years ago, have been unavailing. In each case where the Ministry has answered Embassy communications regarding these children, the replies without exception and after long delay have consisted of cursory statements informing the Embassy that the children in question had acquired Soviet citizenship since they had previously possessed the citizenship of a third state whose territories, in the whole or in part, had been incorporated into the U.S.S.R. during or after the recent war. The notes have concluded by stating that the question of the children's departure from the U.S.S.R. "may be considered in accordance with the regulations established for Soviet citizens."

This latter statement has proved, unfortunately, to be of no practical significance since although these children may apply for permission to depart from the U.S.S.R. in accordance with the procedure established for Soviet citizens, none has, in fact, been permitted to depart. In this regard, the Embassy observes that in the Ministry's note no. 622/KU of April 7, 1949, the Soviet Government made no attempt to refute or deny the reluctant conclusion which the Embassy had drawn from its experience in these cases and which was explicitly formulated in its note no. C-16 of January 14, 1949 concerning the specific case of the Kazun children; namely (a) "that the Ministry considers the possession of Soviet citizenship by minor children sufficient grounds for refusing to allow them to rejoin their parents in the United States", and (b) "that such children cannot expedite their repatriation by following the Ministry's suggestion that they apply for permission to depart from the Soviet Union 'in accordance with the general procedure established for citizens of the U.S.S.R.' since they may apply but may not, in fact, depart."

In this group of cases, and there are over twenty in the Embassy's file, it is further observed that in certain instances the children or the relatives with whom they are residing have now ceased to correspond with the Embassy. In the light of the discriminatory treatment, threats, police interrogations and administrative punishments to which United States citizens have been subjected, particularly during approximately the past 2 years, the Embassy must recognize that silence on the part of these citizens does not necessarily mean

that they have lost their desire to return to the United States.

Reference is also made to cases involving aged women who are not permitted to be reunited with their husbands and children now living in America. As one example, the case of Mrs. Anna Spiegel, a naturalized American citizen, has repeatedly been brought to the Ministry's attention with no apparent result. Mrs. Spiegel's husband, Mr. Charles Spiegel, received a Soviet exit visa in 1945 and is presently residing with his six children in the United States. Mrs. Spiegel is 71 years old, her husband is 76, and she has been attempting to obtain permission to depart from the U.S.S.R. for a period of almost 4 years. In view of the humanitarian aspects of this case and the fact that both Mr. and Mrs. Spiegel are now at an extremely advanced age, the Embassy had hoped that the responsible Soviet authorities might respond to its appeals and permit Mrs. Spiegel to return to the United States. To date, however, such permission has not been forthcoming and the Ministry has not acknowledged the Embassy's last note in this case, no. C-627 of November 1, 1948.

In addition to the foregoing categories of American citizens, there are also a number of American citizens, many of them women, now detained at forced labor in the Soviet Union who were arrested in Eastern Europe or elsewhere during and at the end of the recent war by Soviet military authorities.

In the first category of such American citizens deported to the Soviet Union for forced labor are those who cannot conceivably possess any other citizenship than American. In this group, the case of Margaret Fischer is typical. She was born an American citizen on August 8, 1926, at Buffalo, N.Y. She was included in the American passport of her mother, no. 116166 issued August 13, 1929. Her mother was in 1947 repatriated to the United States where she awaits the return of her daughter from detention at forced labor in the Soviet Union.

Margaret Fischer was arrested in Rumania and deported to the Soviet Union in January, 1945, and forced to work in the Volodarsky Mine, Sverdlovsky Raion, Donskaya Voroshilovskaya Oblast. Her continued detention in labor camps is attested by addresses on cards received by her relatives, giving Lager (detention camp) no.'s 256/1221 (in December 1946), 7470/1220 and 7256/1220 (in 1948). Representations to the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs have been made on ten different occasions, from June 20, 1946 to March 12, 1949. In the only reply received from the Ministry in this case, on January 17, 1947, the Ministry asserted that Margaret Fischer is not an American citizen, but a Rumanian citizen of German extraction. The competent Rumanian authorities have stated that at no time did she acquire Rumanian citizenship. The Embassy's notes calling the Ministry's attention to the fact that the appropriate Rumanian authorities do not claim her as a citizen have been completely ignored.

Where the disputed citizenship is that of Yugoslavia, the Soviet Ministry's reply that the person concerned is a non-United States citizen of German racial origin is definitely incongruous, in view of the fact that all former inhabitants of Yugoslavia of German descent were deprived of their Yugoslav citizenship by the AVNOJ (Anti-Fascist Council of National Liberation) decree of November 21, 1944.

A case in point is that of Mrs. Katherine Mandel Henkel, who was born on April 19, 1922 in Chicago, Illinois and who was included in the American passport of her father, George Mandel, issued August 11, 1937. During the war she was in Yugoslavia until her arrest and deportation to the Soviet Union. Her father, husband, daughter and mother have returned to the United States. Katherine Henkel was arrested on January 1, 1945 following the entry of Soviet troops into Yugoslavia and was deported to the Soviet Union for work in Labor Battalion No. 1211, in the Tashkovka Mine, Popasnensky Raion, Voroshilovgradskaya Oblast. The Embassy on June 14, 1946 addressed an inquiry to the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs on the reasons for the detention of Mrs. Henkel in the Soviet Union. On October 23, 1946, the Soviet Ministry denied that the Soviet authorities had any knowledge of her deportation or whereabouts. After proof of her presence in the Soviet Union had been submitted, and after much delay, the Soviet Ministry asserted on June 5, 1947 that Mrs. Henkel was a Yugoslav citizen of German extraction. This is in direct contradiction of the decree depriving such persons of Yugoslav citizenship.

Similarly, Anthony Miller, Jr., who was born on October 18, 1927, at Detroit, Michigan, has been claimed by the Soviet authorities in like manner to be a Yugoslav citizen, in spite of the fact that his mother, of German descent, lost her Yugoslav citizenship by the November 21, 1944 decree. This American citizen was arrested in Yugoslavia on November 18, 1944, and was sent, as a boy of 17 years, to Labor Battalion no. 1211 at the Tashkovka Mine in Voroshilovgrad Oblast. His continued presence there was confirmed by correspondence in January, 1946 and early in 1947. The Embassy's note of January 6, 1948 was, contrary to usual custom, expeditiously answered by the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs on February 26, 1948, to the effect that "the interned Anton Miller is a citizen of Yugoslavia and a German by racial origin." Five different subsequent representations to the Ministry contesting this interpretation on the basis of the facts earlier stated have been ignored.

In another category of American citizens detained for labor in the Soviet Union are persons whose citizenship status in a third country is not clarified, but about whose American citizenship there can be no question. For example, John Benga, born on August 18, 1924 at Jerome, Pennsylvania, was clearly an American citizen at the

time of his deportation from Hungary to the Soviet Union. His father, Joseph, and his sister, Elizabeth, have both been repatriated to the United States. John Benga was arrested by Soviet military authorities on November 20, 1944, together with his father, and was taken to a prison camp in Debrecen. On December 17, 1944, he was deported to the Soviet Union. The father was released on February 20, 1945 because of ill health. Messages from John Benga to his relatives transmitted through the Soviet Red Cross confirmed his presence in the Soviet Union in February 1946 and again in February 1947.

A released Hungarian deportee has stated that he had been with John Benga in a prisoners' camp in Gorlovka.

Representations were made on twelve separate occasions by the Embassy before the Soviet authorities would even admit that John Benga was known to them. Previously, in the two answers the Embassy was able to elicit from the Ministry, it denied any knowledge of him. A recent reply from the Ministry of July 18, 1949, states that it has knowledge of a Yanosh Josef Benga, and that he is a Hungarian citizen.

The United States never has denied the normal right of the Soviet Government to interpret its own citizenship laws. However, there are many instances in which the Soviet Government has laid claim to American citizens as Soviet citizens in contravention of reason and accepted practice.

For example, John Marshall, born on September 28, 1897, at Utica, New York, of a naturalized American father, lived in the United States for 24 years, before going to Lithuania to represent an American firm, the Lithuania Sales Corporation of Boston, Massachusetts. During his stay there, as a representative of American business interests, he preserved his American citizenship, by having his American passport periodically renewed, five times altogether, since the original passport was issued to him on January 28, 1921. His wife, Pauline, whom he married August 8, 1921, became an American citizen by marriage to John Marshall, and was included in five of his American passports. Aldona, his daughter, born on April 27, 1922, is an American citizen according to United States law, and was also included in all Mr. Marshall's American passports since her birth. According to the Lithuanian law in effect at the time, dual nationality was expressly denied and thus American citizenship was the only citizenship possessed by the Marshall family. Their documentation as American citizens was fully valid up to the time Lithuania was occupied by the Soviet Union.

In spite of this clear record of carefully documented American citizenship, this whole family of American citizens has been treated as Soviet citizens, having been arrested and deported to the interior of the Soviet Union at the end of 1945 or the beginning of 1946. Eight notes were addressed to the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs

by the Embassy, from September 10, 1947, to March 8, 1949, before the Ministry would make any reply whatsoever. In its note of April 13, 1949, the Ministry claimed Joseph Marshall, his wife Pauline, and his daughter Aldona, as Lithuanian by origin and citizens of the Soviet Union.

These cases are typical of the many which have been presented to the Soviet authorities, and their treatment by the Soviet authorities is typical of numerous other cases. At the present time, the Embassy has presented to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs about thirty such cases of the detention of American citizens for forced labor in the Soviet Union.

In recapitulation there are:

1. Approximately 13 American citizens who despite their Soviet documentation as stateless persons or as foreigners residing in the U.S.S.R. have been unable to obtain exit visas.
2. Approximately 20 American citizens who have been erroneously declared Soviet citizens by the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
3. Approximately 2,000 persons having claim to American citizenship, of whom 659 have been verified as American citizens and 112 are pending verification by the United States Department of State. Included in these verified cases are approximately 20 minor children who desire to join their parents in the United States, and a group of elderly women. While some of these 2,000 persons may, in addition to American citizenship, also possess citizenship of the Soviet Union or of a third state, the American Embassy has been unable to maintain communication with them and thereby to verify their citizenship status definitively. In this connection, it is noted that some of these persons are now confined in Soviet forced labor camps, while others have been forcibly resettled in the northeastern area of the Soviet Union.
4. Approximately 32 persons, many of them women, now detained at forced labor in the Soviet Union, who were arrested in Eastern Europe or elsewhere outside of the Soviet Union during or at the end of the recent war by Soviet military or police authorities. Of these, approximately 14 are American citizens with claim to no other citizenship and the American citizenship of 18 others is unquestioned by the United States, although a few of them may also possess citizenship in a third state.

In the light of the record and having regard to the welfare of the many American citizens who are in the Soviet Union and the active interest of the American public in this matter the Government of the United States once again calls upon the Government of the Soviet Union to afford full means of communication between the Embassy of the United States in Moscow and the American citizens residing in the Soviet Union and requests that prompt measures be taken by the Soviet Gov-

ernment with a view to permitting such citizens to leave the territories of the Soviet Union and territories under the occupation of the Soviet Union.

February 28, 1950

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R., in reply to a letter from the Ambassador of the United States at Moscow, Mr. A. Kirk, dated October 4, 1949 and the *aide mémoire* of the United States Embassy dated December 12, 1949 invites the attention of the United States Embassy to the following:

In connection with the requests of the United States Embassy to establish the location of a series of persons, who according to the Embassy's opinion are American citizens the responsible Soviet organs in each case have disclosed the location and citizenship of the persons about whom the Embassy made representations to the ministries and the Embassy has been informed of the results of each disclosure. The results of these disclosures show that the persons referred to in the American Embassy's communications, whose presence on Soviet territory was established, with certain exceptions, are either citizens of the U.S.S.R. or citizens of third states.

In those cases where American citizenship was established of persons concerning whom the Embassy requested permission for their departure from the U.S.S.R., such requests were granted, and these persons received permission to depart from the U.S.S.R. Thus, for example, negotiations were satisfactorily conducted concerning the departure from the U.S.S.R. to the United States of Theodore Luboky (who left the U.S.S.R. September 27, 1947), John Luboky (who left the U.S.S.R. September 29, 1947), Sally Vaitner (who left the U.S.S.R. February 4, 1948), Jeanette Stillman Brown (who left the U.S.S.R. August 18, 1948) and Giselle Kuvtuk (who left the U.S.S.R. December 3, 1948.) Soviet authorities likewise granted permission for the departure to the United States of Allen Carl Khalme, the minor son of a Soviet citizen, inasmuch as his mother, Ollie Irene Khalme, an American citizen wished to return to the United States after the death of her husband, whence both departed the U.S.S.R. on December 1, 1947.

As for persons listed in the letter of Mr. A. Kirk and the *aide mémoire* of the United States Embassy, according to information from the responsible Soviet authorities, 23 of them are citizens of third powers; 13 are Soviet citizens, 3 have not been located on territory of the U.S.S.R., one is a stateless person and one is an American citizen.

The 23 persons who are citizens of third powers left the U.S.S.R. and went to the following countries:

To Rumania—17 persons: Baier, Maria Anna; Hass, Teresa; Hellman, Katerina; Dukarm, John (Hans); Ketsch, Anna Maria; Huber, Eve Theresa; Anton, Anna; Wagner, Hilda Elizabeth;

Wolfart, Louise; Gross, Ottilia Herbat; Kirchner, Mary Hohanna; Klein, Anna; Vormittag, Magdalena; Fischer, Margaret; Zilman, Anna; Schuster, Wilhelmina; Zultner, Helen Magdalena.

To Germany—4 persons: Schuller, Hermine; Bassler, Keethe; Miller, Anthony, Jr.; Henkel, Katherine.

To Poland—one person: Mulawa, Zenon.

To Hungary—one person: Benga, John.

The Soviet citizens as has been established are: Henri Blacha, Valentina Kazun, Vladimir Kazun, Daniel Nikitchik, Fedora Nikitchik, Irene Berko, John Yarema, Joseph Marshall, Paulina Marshall, Aldona Marshall, Anna Spiegel, Nechslav Tseslyak, and Sophie Kazanska.

Responsible Soviet authorities, however, are prepared to grant permission for the departure from the U.S.S.R. for the United States from the above-mentioned list of persons of Anna Spiegel considering her advanced age and the fact that her husband is living permanently in the United States together with six children; the minor children of citizen Kazun Valentin and Vladimir for departure to their father residing permanently in the United States; Henri Blacha, 18, considering that his parents reside permanently in the United States.

Concerning Wladyslawa, Lazarska, Michal Laszkiewicz, and Joseph Thierjung, Jr., the Embassy has already been informed that they were not discovered on territory of the U.S.S.R.

As for George Krivenka mentioned in *aide-mémoire*, he is Hungarian by ethnic origin and is a stateless person. He, as is well known to the Embassy, makes no claim to American citizenship. In his declaration of October 30, 1949 to the Presidium Supreme Soviet U.S.S.R., George Krivenka solicited Soviet citizenship. At the same time, George Krivenka declared that he informed the United States Embassy in Moscow by letter on September 30, 1949 about his decision to remain in the U.S.S.R. and take Soviet citizenship.

Concerning Adele Sagatas, in view of the receipt of supplementary information concerning her American citizenship, responsible Soviet authorities are prepared to give A. Sagatas an exit visa.

Thus the facts show a complete lack of foundation of the assertions contained in the Embassy's *aide-mémoire* that a series of American citizens by unilateral action of Soviet authorities allegedly are being prevented from returning to the United States.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R. notes that the Embassy assertion that an alleged 32 American citizens have been kept in prison by Soviet authorities and are being used "in forced labor" in the Soviet Union belongs to the number of malicious lies, as the Embassy has already been informed in the letter from Minister of Foreign Affairs A. Y. Vyshinsky of August 30, 1949.

As for mention in the Embassy's *aide-mémoire* concerning the facts that certain people are regis-

tered by the Embassy as allegedly being American citizens, in view of the unfoundedness of the assertion that these people are American citizens, the Ministry does not consider it possible to review this question. Furthermore, insofar as in the Embassy's *aide-mémoire* it is pointed out that there may be among these persons likewise persons holding Soviet citizenship, the Ministry considers it necessary to call the Embassy's attention to the fact that the decision of the question concerning the citizenship of Soviet citizens is the exclusive concern of Soviet authorities.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs considers it necessary to direct the attention of the United States Government to the numerous arbitrary acts with regard to Soviet citizens on the part of American authorities. Thus the American authorities are holding in the United States three minor children of Soviet citizen, Ambartsun Cholokyan, Georgei aged twelve, Albert aged ten, and Alice aged five, who at the time of Cholokyan's departure from the United States for the Armenian S.S.R. in November 1947, were in children's homes of Catholic organizations and are not permitted to leave the United States despite categorical demands of their parents.

Although the Ministry has directed the attention of the United States Embassy to the unlawful retention in the United States of the Cholokyan children not only has nothing been undertaken on the part of the American authorities for the elimi-

nation of this arbitrary act but on the contrary the United States Embassy's note of May 27, 1948, contains a direct defense of the unlawful actions taken by the American authorities in this affair.

The arbitrary action taken by American authorities in the United States in relation to Soviet citizens as witnessed by such facts as the arrest in 1949 and the retention in prison for nearly 7 months of Soviet citizen P. Butko at the same time in violation of the Soviet-American agreement of 1933, the Soviet Embassy in the United States was not even informed by the American authorities concerning the arrest of citizen Butko.

The American authorities systematically are placing obstacles in the path of the reunion of long since separated members of families of Soviet citizens from the number of so-called displaced persons and do not permit Soviet citizens to return to their families in the Soviet Union. The American authorities illegally and forcibly are retaining in the American zones of occupation in Germany and Austria tens of thousands of Soviet citizens, so-called displaced persons, and at the same time has the audacity to speak of certain alleged obstacles placed by Soviet authorities in the path of the departure from the Soviet Union of a few persons allegedly American citizens who are in actuality Soviet citizens or citizens of third powers.

All the foregoing shows that the claims of the United States Embassy mentioned above are without foundation.

Bulgarian Militia Indicts Michael Shipkov on False Charges for Second Time

Statement by Secretary Acheson

[Released to the press March 8]

On Sunday, March 5, 1950, through the press and radio, people throughout the world, including those in countries where freedom is suppressed, read, or heard the story of Michael Shipkov.¹

The statement of this Bulgarian citizen and employee of the American Legation, describing his experience in the hands of the Bulgarian Communist Militia, documents for the free world how individuals of moral integrity can be broken and made to serve the interests of those who hold the reins of power in a police state.

Michael Shipkov, together with four co-defendants, has been tried pursuant to the indictment, the falsity of which is revealed by his affidavit. Through the very methods which he so vividly described, following his previous arrest and interrogation, Michael Shipkov was forced to repeat again the details of his first confession and to

repudiate the statements made in his affidavit, which, honoring his written request, the Department of State released for publication.

Michael Shipkov foresaw clearly that he could not resist the Bulgarian Militia's methods of torture if he should fall again into their hands. It was for this reason, among others, that he prepared his affidavit and requested the Legation to make it public.

I dwell on this tragic case for two reasons. First, because it should be made absolutely clear that the true facts in his case are those written by him while still a free man and not those being forced out of him now to serve the purposes of the Communist authorities. Second, because of the strong conviction that Michael Shipkov has set an example which must not be lost. His act of faith should be made to serve the cause of freedom for which he intended it.

The people of the free world cannot but be deeply troubled by the disregard for human rights and human values shown by those forces in Bulgaria which now have control over the fate of Michael Shipkov, just as they were troubled at the time these same forces carried out the judicial murder of Nikola Petkov, leader of the Bulgarian agrarian party, who was tried and executed in 1947.

¹ BULLETIN of Mar. 13, 1950, p. 387.

Flagrant Communist Activities in Bulgaria Produced Break

*Address by Donald R. Heath, Former Minister to Bulgaria*¹

A suspension in diplomatic relations between two countries is a serious step and one not undertaken until every possibility of amicable adjustment has been explored and exhausted. During my 2 years' stay in Bulgaria, I saw this process of exploration and exhaustion of possibilities—the attempts on our side to reach a tenable, if not friendly relationship with the Bulgarian Government, and the hostile actions of the Communist-dominated regime which frustrated them.

The peace treaty that ended hostilities between Bulgaria and the Allied Powers after the defeat of Germany required Bulgaria to take all measures necessary to secure to all persons under Bulgarian jurisdiction, without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion, the enjoyment of human rights and of the fundamental freedoms, including freedom of expression, of press and publication, of religious worship, of political opinion, and of public meeting. Legally this peace treaty is still in force. In its treatment of the Bulgarian people, however, the Bulgarian Communist regime is not only violating the rights of man as visualized by the civilized world but is flagrantly violating a legal agreement which it had entered into with other nations.

At the time of my arrival, the withdrawal of the Allied Control Commission, according to the peace treaty terms, and the United States recognition of the Bulgarian Government had created an atmosphere of surface courtesy upon which it had been our hope to build a more lasting cooperation. But with the rapidly growing dominance of the government by Communist forces, it became as rapidly evident that no adjustment, compromise, or cooperation was possible and that the only *modus vivendi* acceptable to the Communists was one based wholly and exclusively on their own terms.

At first, the campaign against the United States

was conducted through the press and radio in unreasoned mudslinging and incredible diatribes. It sounded as though newspaper editors or radio commentators had at their elbows two boxes: one filled with words such as "warmongers," capitalists, monopolists, enslavers of mankind, colonizers, exploiters, and so on; the other, with the great peoples' democracies, the peoples' will, the peoples' happiness, the great teacher and leader Stalin—or Lenin or Dimitrov—and such. By scrambling names from the first and attaching them to the United States and names from the other to the Soviet or Bulgarian governments, then adding a few verbs, the editor or commentator would have his day's work done.

Concurrently with the propaganda campaign, there existed a systematic plan of action to reduce the United States Legation to a point of complete inefficacy and an object of contempt. Restrictions on travel, red tape procedures for getting the simplest matter done, and similar, at times unbelievably petty, annoyances, seriously hampered the work of the Legation personnel. Much worse still, the plan also included persecution and terrorization of the Legation's Bulgarian employees.

The Shipkov incident is only one of many. There was Ivan Seculov, another translator, who was reported a "suicide" 3 days after his arrest. Others were sentenced to death. Many resigned without giving any reason and were afraid even to bring their letters of resignation personally to the Legation. Others disappeared and were seen long after in some Sofia neighborhood, looking broken in health and spirit, and crossing the street to avoid even nodding recognition.

For many months before the Kostov trial, it had become problematical exactly how long such a situation could be tolerated. The American Legation was the primary target. The demand for my recall on the basis of this trial, which unfolded like a nightmarish travesty of justice, was the final test. It showed clearly that far from there being any hope for improvement in conditions, we could look forward only to their becom-

¹Made over the Columbia Broadcasting System from WTOP in Washington on Mar. 11, 1950, and released to the press on the same date.

ing much worse. It showed the futility of any further efforts at trying to do business with the Bulgarian Government, many of whose present Cabinet Ministers have the sole qualifications of 10- to 20-years resident apprenticeship in Moscow.

I have taken your time with this general background behind the suspension of diplomatic relations because I wanted to emphasize the acute seriousness of the conditions which made it necessary. I believe that Mr. Severeid has questions of a more specific nature to ask me and I will be glad to answer them. Before doing that, though, I

wish to say that the real tragedy of the whole Communist-created break is that the Bulgarian people did not want relations broken with the United States or any other country for that matter. They wish to live in peace and friendship with all the world and to use to the best advantage the resources of their beautiful country. It is not their wish but that of their Communist masters who cut them off from the Western democracies and force their faces exclusively to the East.

Rumania Requested To Clarify Demands for U.S. To Discontinue Information Activities in Bucharest

[Released to the press March 7]

On March 2, 1950, the Deputy Foreign Minister of Rumania (Grigore Preoteasa) summarily notified the American Minister to Rumania (Rudolf E. Schoenfeld) of the Rumanian Government's demand that the United States Information Service Office of the American Legation at Bucharest be discontinued immediately. In response to the inquiries of the American Minister, the Deputy Foreign Minister refused to give any explanation of this demand other than that the Rumanian Government did not regard the USIS activities as a normal function of a diplomatic mission.

Under instructions from the Department of State, the American Minister has addressed a note to the Rumanian Foreign Minister (Madame Ana Pauker), dated March 6, 1950. For the present, the public activities of the USIS Office at Bucharest are suspended. The text of the United States note follows:

I refer to my conversation with the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs in which he informed me of the Rumanian Government's demand that the Information Office of the United States Legation at Bucharest be discontinued forthwith. In this regard, my Government has instructed me to communicate to you the following:

The Government of the United States has taken note of the Rumanian Government's oral demand for the cessation of the USIS activities in Rumania on the grounds that the Rumanian Government does not consider the activities of that Office a normal diplomatic function. The United States Government also notes that the Rumanian Foreign Office declined at the time further to explain its position as regards this demand.

It is observed that the summary character of the Rumanian Government's informal *démarche* was lacking all elements of customary diplomatic practice and courtesy. Moreover, the refusal of the Deputy Foreign Minister to clarify his Government's view that the USIS activities in Rumania do not constitute a normal diplomatic function leaves in doubt the exact nature of the Rumanian Government's demand and its position as regards the informational and cultural activities of diplomatic missions.

The Rumanian Government is requested to set forth precisely in a written communication its views with respect to such activities and the exact extent of its demand. In particular, the Rumanian Government is asked to state whether it considers inappropriate to a diplomatic mission activities of accredited public affairs, press or cultural officers directed toward the exchange of information and the promotion of cultural relations between the peoples of the countries concerned. The United States Government would be interested to know whether the Rumanian Government objects to maintenance by a diplomatic mission of a reading and circulating library, its distribution of a news bulletin, its showing of educational films or exhibits and its arrangement of musical programs.

The progressively severe restrictions imposed over the last three years upon the informational and cultural activities of the United States Legation as a result of the attitude and actions of the Rumanian Government have brought about a situation in which these activities were already reduced to the barest minimum and virtually confined to the premises of the USIS Office. This

in itself was a serious impediment to the free flow of information and to the maintenance of cultural relations between the peoples of the United States and of Rumania. Is it the intention of the Rumanian Government's present demand entirely to block all such channels of communication and thereby further to circumscribe the free and frank exchange of information among the peoples of the world which is so essential to international understanding and peace? Does the Rumanian Government consider it necessary to the achievement of its objectives that the Rumanian people's knowledge of world affairs be limited exclusively to the official version set forth in the Government controlled press?

The United States Government is astonished at this action on the part of the Rumanian Government especially in view of the fact that the latter in recent years has maintained on the staff of its diplomatic mission at Washington press and cultural counselors, that its Legation has conducted various informational and cultural activities in the United States and that its Legation is publishing and distributing a weekly news bulletin. This bulletin is accorded the facilities of the United States mails and its publication is certified to the United States Department of Justice as a legitimate activity of the Rumanian diplomatic representation in the United States. These activities have been sanctioned by the United States Government as an evidence of its adherence to the principles of freedom of press and publication and of established practice. Is the United States Government given to understand by the Rumanian Government's action against the USIS in Rumania that it intends to cease these activities on the part of its diplomatic representatives in the United States?

Without recognizing the right of the Rumanian Government to demand the cessation of the informational and cultural services of the United States Legation at Bucharest, the United States Government is suspending the public activities of its diplomatic mission in this field pending a resolution of the issue through further negotiations, and awaits the Rumanian Government's reply to this communication.

Human Rights Issue Marks First U.S. International Court Appearance

[Released to the press March 2]

Yesterday, for the first time, a representative of the United States appeared before the International Court of Justice, the principal judicial organ of the United Nations, in a public hearing

which opened at The Hague. Appointed by the President of the United States, Benjamin V. Cohen, former counselor of the Department of State and member of the United States delegation to the General Assembly, addressed the Court on behalf of the United States in the advisory proceeding regarding the interpretation of certain clauses of the Treaties of Peace With Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania. Eric Stein of the Office of United Nations Political Affairs, Department of State, acted as adviser to Mr. Cohen. Although the United States in the past submitted written statements to the Court, this marks the first instance of the United States participation in a hearing of the Court.

The present advisory proceeding grew out of the consideration in the United Nations General Assembly of the charges made by a number of members of the United Nations against Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania to the effect that these three governments have denied to their peoples basic human rights and fundamental freedoms. The question was first brought before the United Nations in the spring of 1949 following the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty in Hungary and the Protestant pastors in Bulgaria.

The three governments undertook in the recent treaties of peace to secure the enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms to all persons within their jurisdiction. They are also bound by the obligation to settle all disputes arising out of these treaties in accordance with procedures specified in the disputes articles of the treaties.

Having debated the matter, the General Assembly indicated its grave concern at these charges concerning the suppression of human rights and freedoms and expressed the hope that they would be examined and settled through the machinery provided in the peace treaties. The Governments of Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania refused to take part in the General Assembly proceedings. Moreover, when the United States and other signatories to the peace treaties undertook to utilize the peace treaty machinery for the settlement of the disputes, the three governments refused to cooperate and argued on legal grounds that this machinery was not applicable.

It was at this point that the General Assembly decided in its resolution of October 22, 1949, to request the International Court of Justice to render an advisory opinion on the interpretation of the relevant articles of the peace treaties.

Ten governments, including the Governments of the United States and United Kingdom, submitted to the Court written observations setting forth their views on the legal issues involved. The Governments of Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania as well as that of the U.S.S.R., in written communications to the Court, claimed that it does not have jurisdiction to deal with the matter.

Departments of State and Justice Recommend Deportation of Soviet Spy

[Released to the press March 9]

The Government's recommendation to the Court in the Gubitchev case that execution of sentence on the defendant Gubitchev be suspended on condition of his leaving the United States, pursuant to section 3651 of title 18, United States Code, was made following consultation between the Department of Justice and the Department of State.¹ This recommendation was made to the Court by the Government because it was believed that suspension of the sentence of the defendant Gubitchev, conditioned on his leaving the United States, would best serve the public interest.

The Government considers that Gubitchev did not have diplomatic status in this country and so certified to the Court. The Court held that he was not immune from prosecution for the offense charged. The Soviet Government, however, has maintained continuously that he did possess immunity as a Soviet diplomat, pointing to certain facts which had led it to believe that the United States had accorded Gubitchev diplomatic status. While the Government considers this Soviet view entirely mistaken, it nevertheless believes that defendant Gubitchev should leave the United States rather than be required to serve his sentence here. It is considered important that any misunderstanding by the Soviet Government in regard to the Gubitchev case should not have the consequence of prejudicing the situation of American citizens now in Eastern Europe, including diplomatic officers and other government officials.

Yugoslavia Receives Export-Import Bank Loan

The Export-Import Bank announced on March 1 that it had authorized an additional credit of 20 million dollars to Yugoslavia.

Early in September 1949, the Board of Directors of the Bank approved credits of 20 million dollars in favor of Yugoslavia. Of these, 15 million dollars were to enable Yugoslavia to purchase in the United States capital equipment and materials to rehabilitate the nonferrous mines and related industries so as to permit the country, one of the leading producers of bauxite, mercury, copper, lead, zinc, and other nonferrous materials, to increase its exports to the United States and other hard currency markets. The remaining 5 million

¹Valentin A. Gubitchev, Soviet official and United Nations engineer, was sentenced as a spy on Mar. 9, 1950, to 15 years in prison by Federal Judge Sylvester Ryan. Secretary Acheson informed Soviet Ambassador, Alexander Panyushkin, of the decision of the Departments of State and Justice on Mar. 10, 1950.

dollars was to acquire American industrial materials needed by other Yugoslav export industries and enterprises.

Last December and January, the Government of Yugoslavia applied for further assistance from the Export-Import Bank. The present credit of 20 million dollars is the result of the Bank's consideration and approval of the Yugoslav applications. The purpose of the credits is to enable Yugoslavia to purchase a large variety of American goods, including capital equipment, spare parts, machinery, and materials needed to maintain the present level of the Yugoslav economy.

The credits, which will be available until March 30, 1951, bear interest at 3½ percent per annum and will be amortized in 14 equal semiannual installments beginning on January 1, 1954. A relatively extensive period of grace for the repayment of principal has been provided to enable Yugoslavia to meet heavy payments falling due in the next 3 years.

Nonimmigrant Passport Visa Fees Waived for Portuguese

[Released to the press March 9]

Effective April 1, 1950, nonimmigrant passport visas will be granted to eligible Portuguese citizens who are residents of continental Portugal without fee. For those who qualify as temporary visitors, the visas may be valid for a maximum period of 24 months.

Portuguese citizens who are not residents of continental Portugal remain subject to the statutory fees (\$10.00) for nonimmigrant passport visas, the validity of which shall not be in excess of 12 months.

Effective April 1, 1950, American citizens in possession of valid passports may enter continental Portugal for temporary business, pleasure, or transit purposes without Portuguese visas.

American citizens proceeding to Portuguese territory other than continental Portugal are required to be in possession of valid Portuguese visas and to pay the fees required.

Economists To Visit Mexico

The Department of State has awarded grants to Fritz Machlup, professor of political economy at the Johns Hopkins University, and to Walter Delaplane, head of the department of economics of the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas, for a series of lectures at the National University of Mexico during the month of February.

U.S.-Brazil Cooperation in the Conduct of International Affairs

Remarks by Assistant Secretary Edward G. Miller¹

Loyalty is one of the supreme qualities of the Brazilian people and of Brazil as a nation. In my country we are profoundly conscious of the historic nature of Brazilian loyalty. More than that, we are deeply appreciative. No American who lived among you in the momentous days of 1942 and 1943, when we shared a common peril, can forget the steadfast quality of Brazilian friendship. It was the friendship of a common devotion, based on common ideals. Our two nations were comrades in arms. How well I remember the emotion of those days, whenever a new convoy came into the harbor of this city with supplies of scarce commodities, under the protection of Brazilian and United States naval forces working together! We in the United States will always remember the valor that your young men, the men of Brazil, demonstrated on the battlefields of Italy.

Brazil provides an especially appropriate setting for me to say a word about one basic aspect of my country's foreign policy. If I were required briefly to summarize that policy, I would do so by expressing just two thoughts, one negative and one positive. The negative thought is that our foreign policy is directed against no one. We ask nothing of any nation except its friendship and understanding. Our policy on nonintervention reflects our profound belief that every sovereign nation is entitled to the dignity of its own independence and consequently, is itself responsible for solving its own problems. Those are the terms within which we must cooperate. They create the basis of validity for international cooperation.

The positive aspect of our foreign policy, then, is that we stand ready to cooperate with other friendly nations in programs designed progressively to translate our ideal concept of democracy into a working reality. We have obviously not been perfect in carrying out this policy. We have undoubtedly made errors. However, I look to the

future, which today seems to be immensely fruitful in its possibilities for cooperation between us. The immense potential of this great country—its tremendous natural resources—offer a great hope for its increasing prosperity and can contribute much to the economic stability of this hemisphere. I see no reason why, specifically, our two great countries, on the basis of their historic friendship, cannot work out a system of cooperation through which, with full regard for the equal dignity of each, the common desires of our peoples for a closer interchange can be fulfilled. It is precisely with the development of inter-American cooperation that our conference of ambassadors, meeting in this hospitable atmosphere of Brazil, has especially concerned itself. We hope that, out of our discussions will emerge positive recommendations regarding this cooperation that will lead to new achievements responding to our common benefit and memorializing our historic friendship.

Our presence here today reminds me of the third Pan-American conference, held in Rio de Janeiro in 1906, when the great Baron of Rio Branco was your foreign minister. That conference was presided over by another great Brazilian, who contributed immeasurably to the development of a constructive inter-Americanism. I refer to that beloved statesman Joaquim Nabuco. Joaquim Nabuco was, at the time, Ambassador to the United States. It is, I think, symbolic that today one of his sons, Mauricio Nabuco, is Ambassador to the United States and, in that capacity, is carrying forward his father's great work.

Let me, in conclusion express our gratitude to the Brazilian Government for the privilege of holding this domestic United States conference in Rio de Janeiro, and for its splendid hospitality. We are especially indebted to President Dutra, to Minister Raul Fernandes, and to Minister Cyro de Freitas-Valle, for their hospitable attentions and cordial helpfulness. May Brazil and the United States march forward together in that spirit to the final realization of their common aims!

¹ Made at Rio de Janeiro on Mar. 8, 1950, and released to the press on the same date.

Support of Objectives of Caribbean Commission Reaffirmed

[Released to the press March 6]

The four member governments of the Caribbean Commission—France, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and the United States—today issued a statement reaffirming the member governments continuing support of the objectives and principles of the Caribbean Commission and announcing policies on certain recommendations of the West Indian Conference (third session).

In this statement, which was issued simultaneously today in the Caribbean area, Paris, London, and The Hague, the four Governments reaffirm the principles that the Caribbean Commission is an agency of the member and territorial governments for the collection of factual information and statistics on problems of regional significance; a clearing house for the dissemination of such information and statistics; and an agency for reporting and making recommendations on specific problems of economic and social development. In its role as a coordinating agency, the Commission will place at the disposal of the Caribbean territories as wide a range of technical assistance as possible by such means as sponsoring the exchange of scientific and technical information, by developing scholarship arrangements and direct exchange of technical workers.

Support is reaffirmed of the West Indian Conference as an advisory body for making recommendations on matters of mutual interest in the social and economic field and bringing these recommendations to the attention of the governments for implementation.

The governments welcome specific action which has already been taken on certain recommendations made by the biennial West Indian Conference (third session) held at Guadeloupe, December 1-14, 1948. Singled out for particular mention are the establishment of a regional Caribbean Interim Tourist Committee which it is hoped will contribute largely to the development of the tourist industry in that area; the establishment before the 1949 hurricane season of improvements in a uniform hurricane warning system; the granting of thirty scholarships to Caribbean territories by the University of Puerto Rico in its School of Industrial Arts; and the publication of a valuable *Yearbook of Caribbean Research*.

So far as future joint action is concerned, the governments pledge their continued support to the principle of industrial diversification appropriate to the economies of the various Caribbean territories, as a means of supplementing and diversifying their economies. Further, the governments express interest in seeing that trade barriers are kept to a minimum with a view to promoting trade and in keeping telegraph and telephone rates as low as

possible. Believing that every encouragement should be given to interterritorial transportation, the four governments support the removal of all forms of discrimination affecting sea and air transport engaged in international trade within, to and from the Caribbean. The principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights are cited as a guide to the Caribbean legislatures insofar as such principles have not already been incorporated in the local statutes of the territories.

The United States Government welcomes the opportunity to join with the other governments having responsibility for non-self-governing territories in the Caribbean area in making this declaration of general principles and specific objectives to be pursued jointly. It particularly welcomes the reaffirmation of support of the Caribbean Commission and the West Indian Conference as regional advisory bodies for making recommendations on regional social and economic matters of mutual concern and of bringing such recommendations to the attention of the four member governments and the fourteen territorial governments.

The Caribbean Commission is an outgrowth of the former Anglo-American Caribbean Commission which was established March 9, 1942, for the purpose of encouraging and strengthening social and economic cooperation between the United States and the United Kingdom and their non-self-governing territories in the Caribbean area. Its aims and functions were thus, from the beginning, related to a world at peace, and, in 1945, France and the Netherlands joined the body, thus bringing within its scope all of the non-self-governing territories of this region. Originally working within a limited framework imposed by wartime conditions, the Caribbean Commission nevertheless continued to work on its long-range objectives of promoting scientific, technological, and economic development.

Letters of Credence

Costa Rica

The newly appointed Ambassador of Costa Rica, Señor Don Mario Echandi Jiménez, presented his credentials to the President on March 10, 1950. For texts of the Ambassador's remarks and the President's reply, see Department of State press release 231 of March 10, 1950.

Panama

The newly appointed Ambassador of Panama, Señor Don Rodolfo Florencio Herbruger, presented his credentials to the President on March 10, 1950. For texts of the Ambassador's remarks and the President's reply, see Department of State press release 230 of March 10, 1950.

New U.S.-Canadian Treaty on Uses of Niagara River Water

A treaty between the United States and Canada relating to uses of the water of the Niagara River was signed at Washington February 27. Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, signed for this country and Hume Wrong, Canadian Ambassador, signed on behalf of Canada.¹

The new treaty has a twofold objective. First, it is intended to make certain that the scenic grandeur of the Falls and Rapids is safeguarded for future generations of Americans and Canadians. The treaty contains two main provisions for this purpose. One reserves adequate quantities of water for flow over the Falls and through the Rapids, and the other authorizes the construction of remedial works to insure an unbroken crestline at the Falls.

A previous treaty, and other arrangements between the United States and Canada, concerning the uses of water from the Niagara River have provided that certain given quantities of water could be withdrawn from the River for a stated use but have not guaranteed any set amount to safeguard the scenic spectacle. The present treaty insures the continuing flow of sufficient amounts of water over the Falls and through the Rapids of the Niagara River.

This principle of preserving the flow over the Falls, and providing remedial works, was recommended over 20 years ago by the Special Niagara Board, composed of two United States and two Canadian members. The final report of this group, completed in 1928, was a useful guide to the treaty makers in 1949 and 1950.

The other main purpose of the treaty is to place the diversions of water from the Niagara River for power purposes on a permanent legal foundation. The basis for the diversions now being made is supplied by the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 and by a series of subsequent note exchanges which provide temporarily for additional diversions.

Because there is only temporary authorization for some of the existing diversions, the long overdue redevelopment of the power potential of the River has of necessity been postponed both in Canada and in the United States. Such redevelopment would take full advantage of the most modern engineering techniques, which make possible the generation of far more energy from any given amount of water at the Falls than was feasible at the time when many of the present power plants were constructed. Although the lack of power in Northeastern United States and Southeastern Canada is so serious that even this redevelopment would by no means lessen the need for the St. Lawrence development, it would constitute one important measure for increasing the supply

¹ For complete text of the treaty, see Department of State press release 177 of Feb. 27, 1950.

of energy to the industrial areas within transmission distance of the Falls on both sides of the border.

The treaty will establish the required legal foundation for this redevelopment by cancelling the existing exchanges of notes and by providing instead that water not reserved for scenic or other purposes shall be available for power uses and shall be divided equally between the two countries.

It is expected, therefore, that the new treaty will be of lasting benefit to the large numbers of people who come to Niagara Falls to enjoy the scenic spectacle, to the users of electrical power, and to those people who depend on American and Canadian industry in this area and make use of its products.

U.S. Has No Objection to Mexico's Claim to Coronados Islands

[Released to the press March 9]

The Department of State has been asked whether the United States has any claim to the sovereignty of the Coronados Islands which lie off the coast of Mexico. The inquiry arose in connection with action in the courts of California concerning a fishing vessel.

The Department has replied that the United States has never made any objection to Mexico's claim of sovereignty over the islands of Los Coronados. On the contrary, in the span of a 100 years, various agencies of the United States Government have acknowledged on many occasions either by implications or in official documents that these islands are a possession of the United Mexican States. The Government of the United States does not now have any reason to change position with respect to the claim by Mexico of sovereignty over the Coronados Islands.

Tax Treaty Discussions With Uruguay

[Released to the press February 17]

Discussions are expected to be opened at an early date at Washington between United States and Uruguayan officials to consider whether a basis exists for conventions for the avoidance of double taxation with respect to taxes on income and to taxes on the estates of deceased persons.

In preparation for the discussions, interested persons are invited to submit information and suggestions to Eldon P. King, Special Deputy Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Bureau of Internal Revenue, Washington, D. C.

Status of Members of the Armed Forces of the Brussels Treaty Powers

His Royal Highness the Prince Regent of Belgium, the President of the French Republic, President of the French Union, Her Royal Highness the Grand Duchess of Luxembourg, Her Majesty the Queen of the Netherlands and His Majesty the King of Great Britain, Ireland and the British Dominions beyond the Seas,

Desiring to define the conditions applicable to armed forces of any one of them stationed in the territory of any other of them in conformity with the Treaty signed at Brussels the 17th March, 1948, hereinafter referred to as the Brussels Treaty,

Have appointed as their Plenipotentiaries:

His Royal Highness the Prince Regent of Belgium
His Excellency Vicomte Obert de Thieusies, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of Belgium in London,

The President of the French Republic, President of the French Union

His Excellency Monsieur René Massigli, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the French Republic in London,

Her Royal Highness the Grand Duchess of Luxembourg
His Excellency Monsieur André Clasen, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of Luxembourg in London,

Her Majesty the Queen of the Netherlands
His Excellency Jonkheer E. Michiels van Verduynen, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Netherlands in London,

His Majesty the King of Great Britain, Ireland and the British Dominions beyond the Seas for the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
The Right Honourable Ernest Bevin, Member of Parliament, Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs,

who, having exhibited their full powers found in good and due form, have agreed as follows:—

ARTICLE 1

Definitions

In this Agreement the expression—

(a) "*foreign force*" means an armed force maintained by a Contracting Party in the execution of duties under the Brussels Treaty situated in the territory of another Contracting Party;

(b) "*sending State*" means the Party maintaining the force; and

EDITOR'S NOTE: Appendixes referred to in this treaty are not here printed.

(c) "*receiving State*" means the Party in the territory of which the force is stationed or through which it is passing in transit;

(d) "*members of a foreign force*" means members of that force travelling or resident in the execution of their duties under the Brussels Treaty in the territory of a Contracting Party other than the "sending State."

ARTICLE 2

1. For the purposes of this Agreement, the members of an armed force are classified as follows:—

- (i) Personnel on permanent duty;
- (ii) Personnel on temporary duty;
- (iii) Regularly constituted units or formations.

2. The nominal roll of personnel in category (1) above shall be kept up to date by the Secretariat-General of the Brussels Treaty Defence Organisation and forwarded to the representatives on the Permanent Commission of the Brussels Treaty for transmission to their Governments.

ARTICLE 3

1. On the conditions specified in paragraph 2, the "members of a foreign force" shall be exempt from passport and visa regulations on entering or leaving the territory of any of the Contracting Parties. They shall also be exempt from the regulations on the registration and control of aliens.

2. The following documents only will be required in respect of "members of a foreign force." They must be presented on demand:

- (i) Personnel on permanent duty—
 - (a) Officers: Tri-lingual identity card.
(As in Appendix A.)
 - (b) N.C.O.'s and Other Ranks:
Personal service identity card;
Individual tri-lingual Movement Order.
(As in Appendix B.)
- (ii) Personnel on temporary duty—
Personal service identity card;
Individual tri-lingual Movement Order.
(As in Appendix B.)
- (iii) Regularly constituted units or formations—
Personal service identity card;
Collective tri-lingual Movement Order.
(As in Appendix C.)

Tri-lingual identity cards will be made out and issued to officers on permanent duty by the Secretariat-General of the Brussels Treaty Defence Organisation.

Individual tri-lingual Movement Orders will be filled in and issued by the Service Ministries of the "sending State."

Collective tri-lingual Movement Orders will be filled in and issued by Service Ministries of the "sending State" and counter-signed by the representative of the Service Minister concerned of the "receiving State" or, if necessary, "receiving States."

ARTICLE 4

The "receiving State," during the period before the provisions of the Convention on Road Traffic signed at Geneva, the 19th September, 1949, relating to driving licences or permits come into force so far as it is concerned, will either—

(a) accept as valid without a driving test the driving licences or military driving permits issued by the "sending State"; or

(b) issue its own licence to any "member of a foreign force" who holds a driving licence or military permit issued by the "sending State" without requiring him to undergo a driving test. Unless he holds an international driving permit, the statutory fee will be payable.

After this period the "receiving State" will follow alternative (a) above exclusively.

ARTICLE 5

1. The "members of a foreign force" will wear uniform.

They may, however, wear civilian dress; the regulations governing the wearing of civilian dress will be those in force in the "receiving State" for its own forces.

Regularly constituted units or formations of a "foreign force" must be in uniform when crossing a frontier.

2. Military vehicles shall carry, in addition to their registration number, a distinctive nationality mark, the form of which shall be agreed by the Military Committee of the Defence Organisation of the Brussels Treaty.

ARTICLE 6

1. The possession and carrying of arms by "members of a foreign force" shall be subject to the same laws and regulations as are applied to the forces of the "receiving State."

2. "Members of a foreign force" in transit may carry arms, on condition that this is authorised by their Movement Orders, and that the weapons are unloaded and are carried in the regulation manner.

3. In any case, officers of a "foreign force" are always authorised to retain possession of their regulation personal weapons.

ARTICLE 7

1. It is the duty of "members of a foreign force" to respect the laws in force of the "receiving State" and to abstain from any activity inconsistent with the spirit of the present Agreement, and, in particular, from any political activity.

2. "Members of a foreign force" who commit an offence in the "receiving State" against the laws in force in that State can be prosecuted in the courts of the "receiving State."

When the act is also an offence against the law of the "sending State," the authorities of the "receiving State" will examine with the greatest sympathy any request, received before the court has declared its verdict, for the transfer of the accused for trial before the courts of the "sending State."

Where a "member of a foreign force" commits an offence against the security of, or involving disloyalty to, the "sending State" or an offence against its property, or an offence against a member of the force to which he belongs, the authorities of the "receiving State" where the offence was committed will prosecute only if they consider that special considerations require them to do so.

The competent military authorities of the "foreign force" shall have, within the "receiving State," any jurisdiction conferred upon them by the law of the "sending State" in relation to an offence committed by a member of their own armed forces.

3. In all cases where a "member of a foreign force" commits on the territory of the "receiving State" an offence either against the law of the "receiving State" or against

the law of the "sending State," the authorities of both States will assist each other in the collection of evidence and the carrying out of all necessary investigations, including the seizure, and in proper cases the handing over of exhibits and of objects connected with the offence.

The handing over of the exhibits and of the objects seized may, however, be made subject to their return within the time specified by the authority delivering them.

4. Where the authorities of the "receiving State" consider that, in respect of an offence committed in the "receiving State" by a "member of a foreign force," the necessities of the investigation, trial and execution of sentence require the imprisonment of the offender, the authorities of the "foreign force" will assist in making the arrest, if the offender can be found and arrested in the territory of the "receiving State."

The authorities of the "receiving State" will, in the same way, furnish every facility for the tracing and arrest of "members of a foreign force" wanted by the "sending State" in respect of an offence committed in the "receiving State." These authorities will, as soon as possible, hand over on their own territory to the "sending State" any "member of a foreign force" so arrested. They will also hand over to the "sending State" any "member of a foreign force" whom they may have imprisoned on a charge against their laws but whom they have decided not to prosecute.

5.—(a) A "foreign force" shall have, in the conditions and within the limits defined in (b) and (d) below, the right to police any camps, establishments or other premises (hereinafter referred to under the general term "camp") which they have occupied as a result of an agreement with the "receiving State."

(b) The military police of the "foreign force" may take all appropriate measures to ensure the maintenance of order in such camps. They shall hand over to the police of the "receiving State," without delay, any person caught in the act of committing or about to commit or just having committed an offence against the laws of the "receiving State."

(c) The police of the "receiving State" may enter any camp for the purpose of arresting any person who is suspected of being guilty of an offence against the laws of the "receiving State."

(d) The military police of a "foreign force" may only be employed outside its camps at the request of the authorities of the "receiving State" and in liaison with those authorities and in so far as such employment is necessary to maintain order and discipline among the members of the force. The "foreign force" shall comply with any such request.

ARTICLE 8

1. Subject to paragraph 2 of this Article, each Contracting Party will be responsible for paying compensation for damage to third parties, caused in its territory by armed forces which are present there as a consequence of the Brussels Treaty in all cases where there would be a right to compensation if the damage had been caused by its own armed forces.

Subject to paragraph 6 below, claims by third parties in respect of this damage will be filed and considered, and decisions will be taken thereon, in accordance with the laws and regulations applicable in the "receiving State" to claims for damage caused by its own armed forces. If these claims are not settled by agreement, they shall be decided by the tribunals of the "receiving State," who are competent in case of damage caused by its own armed forces and in that case the Government of the "receiving State" will ensure the defence against the claims.

2. The provisions of this Article do not apply to:—

(a) Maritime salvage claims against a vessel used in connection with the Brussels Treaty or claims against such a vessel for damage caused by collision. These claims will be brought against the authorities of the Party to whom the vessel belongs.

(b) Any damage suffered (i) to his person by a "member of an armed force" of any Party, while on duty, or (ii) by any property belonging to the State and used by Service Ministries (Navy, Army, Air Force) of any Party or its forces.

In both these cases no claim shall lie against the State to whose forces the person responsible for the damage belongs.

3. Subject to paragraph 4 of this Article, the cost of satisfying the claims referred to in paragraph 1 will be, at such intervals as may be agreed, distributed between the Parties in proportions which shall be provisionally, in default of subsequent agreement to the contrary, as follows:—

	Percent.
United Kingdom-----	50
France-----	25
Belgium-Netherlands-Luxembourg-----	25

4. The State on whose territory the damage has been caused will have no claim to contributions under paragraph 3 in respect of the cost of damage for which its own forces are exclusively responsible.

5. The Chiefs-of-Staff Committee of the Brussels Treaty Defence Organisation will decide in case of doubt whether the provisions of paragraph 4 are applicable in any particular case.

6. In the case of damage to State property (not excluded by paragraph 2 above and not covered by paragraph 4 above), the amount of the damage will be assessed by an arbitrator nominated by the "receiving State," after consultation with the other Parties, and chosen from amongst its own nationals who hold or who have held high judicial office and will be distributed in accordance with paragraph 3 above.

This paragraph does not apply if the amount of the damage is less than—

Belgium-----	B.fr. 70,000
France-----	F.fr. 490,000
Luxembourg-----	L.fr. 70,000
Netherlands-----	fl. 5,320
United Kingdom-----	£500

In the case of considerable variation in the rates of exchange between these currencies the Contracting Parties shall, by exchange of letters, agree on the appropriate adjustments of these amounts.

7. Claims arising out of contracts concluded by "members of a foreign force" in the course of their duties are excluded from the operation of the preceding provisions of this Article. They shall be dealt with by the authorities of the "foreign force" and the courts of the "receiving State" shall have jurisdiction in regard thereto if they cannot otherwise be settled.

ARTICLE 9

1. Claims (other than contractual claims) against "members of a foreign force" arising out of tortious acts or omissions, not relating to the performance of their duties, shall be dealt with in accordance with the following paragraphs of this Article.

2. The Governments of the "receiving State" will consider the claim and assess the compensation in a just and fair manner, taking into account all the circumstances of the case, including the conduct of the injured person, and will prepare a report on the matter. This report will then be delivered to the authorities of the "sending State," who will then decide without delay whether they will offer an *ex gratia* payment and, if so, of what amount. If these authorities decide to offer an *ex gratia* payment, they will offer to settle the claim by making this payment themselves. If this offer is accepted, they will inform the "receiving State" of their decision and of the sum paid.

3. Nothing in the preceding paragraphs of this Article shall affect the jurisdiction of the courts of the "receiving

State" to entertain the claims to which this Article relates brought against "members of a foreign force."

ARTICLE 10

If any question arises whether a tortious act or an omission of a "member of a foreign force" relates to the performance of his duties, the question shall be submitted to the arbitrator referred to in paragraph 6 of Article 8, whose decision on this point shall be final and conclusive in any court before which the claim for compensation may be brought. The arbitrator shall be furnished with all the information necessary to enable him to render a decision judicially.

ARTICLE 11

1. "Members of a foreign force" may purchase locally goods necessary for their own consumption and such services as they need under the same conditions as the nationals of the "receiving State."

2. Goods required for the subsistence of a "foreign force" will normally be purchased through the competent service departments which purchase such goods for the armed forces of the "receiving State." In order to avoid such purchases having any adverse effect on the economy of the "receiving State," the competent authorities of this State will indicate, when necessary, any articles the purchase of which should be restricted or entirely forbidden.

3. After agreement between the military authorities of the "sending" and "receiving States," the competent military authorities of the "receiving State" will assume sole responsibility for making suitable arrangements to make available to a "foreign force" the buildings and ground which it requires. These agreements and arrangements will be, as far as possible, in accordance with the regulations governing the accommodation and billeting of troops of the "receiving State." In the absence of a specific contract, the laws of the "receiving State" shall determine the rights, arising out of the occupation, of the owner of the buildings or ground occupied.

4. Civilian labour requirements of a "foreign force" will be satisfied in the same way as those of the military authorities of the "receiving State" and with the assistance of those authorities through the employment exchanges. The conditions of employment and work, in particular wages, supplementary payments and conditions for the protection of workers, shall be those laid down by the legislation of the "receiving State." Civilian workers employed by a "foreign armed force" shall not be regarded for any purpose as being members of that "force."

5. When a "foreign force" has at the place where it is stationed inadequate medical or dental facilities, the members of that force may receive medical and dental care, including hospitalisation, under the same conditions as the forces of the "receiving State."

6. The "receiving State" will give the most favourable consideration to requests for the grant to "members of a foreign force" of travelling facilities on its railways and of concessions with regard to fares. These facilities and concessions will be the subject of special arrangements to be made between the Governments concerned.

7. Subject to any general or particular financial arrangements between the Parties, payment in local currency for goods, accommodation and services furnished under paragraphs 2, 3, 4 and, if necessary, 5, will be made promptly by the military authorities of the "foreign force."

8. The "foreign force" shall not by reason of this Article enjoy any exemption from taxes or duties relating to purchases and services chargeable under the fiscal regulations of the "receiving State."

ARTICLE 12

1. "Members of a foreign force" shall—

(a) enjoy exemption from income tax levied in the

"receiving State" on any pay or allowances which they receive from the Government of the "sending State." Such other exemptions from income tax as may be desirable to avoid any appreciable prejudice to "members of a foreign force" by reason of their service abroad, shall be agreed by the Parties and put into force as soon as possible;

(b) be entitled to temporary exemption from duty and taxes on private motor vehicles imported temporarily for their own personal use. There is no obligation under this Article to grant any exemption from taxes payable in respect of the use of the roads by motor vehicles.

2. For the purpose of the levy of death duties on the estate of a deceased "member of a foreign force," the fact that he has been present in the "receiving State" shall not be regarded as creating a change of domicile or residence so far as he is concerned, and the tangible movable property of the deceased which is situated on the territory of the "receiving State" only by reason of his service there, shall be considered as not being situated on that territory.

ARTICLE 13

1. Save as provided expressly to the contrary in this Agreement, "members of a foreign force" are subject to the laws and regulations administered by the Customs Authorities of the "receiving State."

In particular, the Customs Officers will have the right, under the general conditions laid down by the laws and regulations of the "receiving State," to search "members of a foreign force" and to examine their luggage and vehicles.

2. The entry, departure and use of registered military vehicles shall be authorised free of all tax or duty on presentation of a triptyque in the form shown in Appendix D. These vehicles shall also be exempted from any tax payable in respect of the use of vehicles on the roads.

3. Official documents under official seal will not be subject to Customs inspection. Couriers carrying these documents, whatever their rank, must be in possession of an Individual Movement Order, issued in accordance with Article 3. This Movement Order will show the number of despatches carried and certify that they contain only official documents.

4. Reasonable quantities of provisions, supplies and other goods, imported by the authorities of a "foreign force" for the exclusive use of that force, shall be exempt from Customs duties and all other duties and taxes payable on importation. This duty-free importation shall be subject to the deposit, at the Customs Office, together with the Customs documents, of a certificate signed by an Officer authorised for that purpose.

A specimen of this certificate is given in Appendix E. The list of the Officers authorised in each "foreign force" to sign the certificates, as well as specimens of their signatures and the stamps used, shall be sent to the Customs administration of the "receiving State."

Imports made by the authorities of a "foreign force" other than for the exclusive use of their force, and imports effected personally by "members of a foreign force" are not, by reason of this Article, entitled to any exemption from taxes and duties or other conditions.

5. Goods which have been imported duty-free under paragraph 4 above—

(i) can be re-exported to the country of origin of the goods or to the "sending State" provided that a certificate, issued in accordance with paragraph 4 above, is presented to the Customs Office. The Customs Authorities, however, may verify that goods re-exported are as described in the certificate and have in fact been imported under the conditions of paragraph 4;

(ii) cannot normally be disposed of in the "receiving State" by way of either sale or gift. However, in particular cases, such disposal may be authorised on conditions imposed by the Customs Authorities (for instance on pay-

ment of duty and tax and compliance with the requirements of the controls of trade and exchange).

6. Goods purchased in the "receiving State" can only be exported therefrom in accordance with the regulations in force in the "receiving State."

7. Special facilities for crossing frontiers shall be granted by the Customs Authorities to regularly constituted units or formations, provided that the Customs Authorities concerned have been duly notified sufficiently in advance.

8. Special arrangements shall be made so that fuel oil and lubricants for use on service in military vehicles, aircraft and vessels, may be delivered free of all duties and taxes.

ARTICLE 14

1. The Customs or Fiscal Authorities of the "receiving State" may, as a condition of the grant of any Customs or Fiscal exemption or concession provided for in this Agreement, require such conditions to be observed as they may deem necessary to prevent abuse.

2. These authorities may refuse any exemption provided for by this Agreement in respect of the importation into the "receiving State" of articles grown, produced or manufactured in that State which have been exported therefrom without payment of, or upon repayment of, taxes or duties which would have been chargeable but for such exportation.

Goods removed from a Customs warehouse shall be deemed to be imported if they were regarded as having been exported by reason of being deposited in the warehouse.

ARTICLE 15

1. In order to prevent offences against Customs and Fiscal Laws and Regulations of a "receiving State," the Customs and Fiscal Authorities of the "receiving State" and the Military Authorities of a "foreign force" will afford each other mutual assistance in the conduct of enquiries and the collection of evidence.

2. The Military Authorities of the "foreign force" will render all assistance within their power to ensure that articles liable to seizure by or on behalf of the Customs or Fiscal Authorities of the "receiving State" are handed to those authorities.

3. "Members of a foreign force" committing offences against the Customs, Foreign Exchange and Fiscal Laws and Regulations of the "receiving State" will be dealt with under the normal rules of the "receiving State," but before any offender is prosecuted in a Court of Law, the facts shall be communicated to the competent military authority of the "foreign force." This authority will render all assistance within its power to ensure the payment of duties, taxes and penalties payable by "members of the foreign force."

4. Military vehicles and articles belonging to a "foreign force" seized in connection with an offence against the Customs and Fiscal Laws and Regulations will be handed over to the appropriate authorities of the "foreign force" concerned.

ARTICLE 16

1. "Members of a foreign force" remain subject to the Foreign Exchange Regulations of the "sending State," and are also subject to the regulations of the "receiving State."

2. The Foreign Exchange Authorities of the "sending" and the "receiving States" may, however, issue special regulations applicable to a "foreign force."

ARTICLE 17

If any Party is involved in war, each of the Contracting Parties shall have the right to suspend immediately the application of any of the provisions of this Agreement so far as its own territory is concerned.

If this right is exercised, the Parties will immediately consult with a view to agreeing on suitable provisions to replace the provisions suspended.

ARTICLE 18

All differences between the Contracting Parties relating to the interpretation or application of the Agreement shall be settled between the Parties and there shall be no recourse to any outside jurisdiction. Except where express provision is made to the contrary in the Agreement, the Parties will make use of the machinery of the Permanent Commission for the settlement of such differences.

ARTICLE 19

Any Party may at any time request that a meeting of representatives of all the Parties to this Agreement should be held to consider the revision of any Article of this Agreement. The request for a meeting shall be addressed to the Secretary-General of the Permanent Commission, who shall convoke a meeting within three months from the date of the receipt of this request. If at any such meeting agreement is reached on the revision of any provisions of this Agreement, a protocol containing the revised provisions shall be drawn up, and shall come into force as soon as it has been approved by all the Contracting Parties.

ARTICLE 20

The present Agreement shall be ratified. The Instruments of Ratification shall be deposited as soon as possible with the Secretary-General of the Permanent Commission. It shall enter into force one month after the receipt of the fifth ratification.

ARTICLE 21

1. After the expiry of four years from the entry into force of the Agreement, any Contracting Party may transmit a notice of Denunciation to the Secretary-General of the Permanent Commission. He shall immediately inform all the other Contracting Parties of the receipt of the notice of Denunciation and shall as soon as possible convoke a conference of all the Contracting Parties to consider the situation. A notice of Denunciation shall take effect one year after the date on which it is deposited, unless it is withdrawn.

2. The present Agreement shall remain in force until notice of Denunciation deposited in accordance with paragraph 1 of this Article has taken effect.

In witness whereof the above-mentioned Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Agreement and have affixed thereto their seals.

Done this 21st day of December, 1949, in English and French, both texts being equally authoritative, in a single copy which will remain deposited in the archives of the Permanent Commission. The Secretary-General of the Permanent Commission shall transmit certified copies of this Agreement to all signatory Governments.

As soon as possible, a text of this Agreement in the Netherlands language will be prepared and as soon as this text has been agreed by all signatory Governments the text in the Netherlands language will also be authoritative.

For Belgium:

OBERT DE THIEUSIES.

For France:

R. MASSIGLI.

For Luxembourg:

A. J. CLASEN.

For the Netherlands:

E. MICHIELS VAN VERDUYNEN.

For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:

ERNEST BEVIN.

Army and Air Force Mission Agreements With Honduras

[Released to the press March 6]

Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, and Rafael Heliodoro Valle, Ambassador of Honduras to the United States, signed today two agreements providing for the detail of officers and enlisted men of the United States Army and of the United States Air Force, respectively, as advisory missions to serve in Honduras. The agreements are to continue in force for 4 years from the date of signature and may be extended beyond that period at the request of the Government of Honduras.

The agreements are similar to numerous other agreements in force between the United States and certain other American Republics providing for the detail of officers and enlisted men of the United States Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps to advise the armed forces of those countries. The provisions of the agreements relate to the duties, rank, and precedence of the personnel of the missions, the travel accommodations to be provided for the members of the missions and their families, and other related matters.

Visit of Bolivian Gynecologist

Dr. Roberta Suarez Morales, Dean, School of Gynecologists, University of La Paz, Bolivia, has arrived in Washington where he will spend several days before beginning a series of visits to various cities for the purpose of observing hospital organization and gynecology hospitals, and conferring with colleagues in his field. His visit has been made possible through a grant-in-aid awarded by the Department of State.

Dr. Suarez is interested in observing gynecological and obstetrical operative techniques in the principal medical centers.

Visit of Chilean Mathematician

Domingo Almendras, Chief of the Technical Advisory Department of the Chilean Government's General Bureau of Statistics, Ministry of Finance, Economy, and Commerce and a member of the Reorganizing Committee of that Bureau, has arrived in Washington from Santiago, Chile, for a 1½-months visit. He will consult with officials of the Bureau of Census, Department of Commerce, concerning various phases of its work and with specialists in his field in various cities. His visit was facilitated by a grant-in-aid awarded by the Department of State in cooperation with the Department of Commerce.

Continued Aid to Korea Requested

*Statement by Secretary Acheson*¹

I appreciate the invitation to appear before your Committee with Mr. Hoffman to explain to you briefly why I feel the continuation of the Korean economic recovery program for a second year is of real importance to the success of American foreign policy. I shall indeed be brief because I know that, although I myself was not present, this matter was fully discussed with you by Mr. Webb and Mr. Hoffman² only a few months ago. In addition, I have referred to the importance of our Korean program in discussions we have had during the present session.

I believe the main questions we have to consider are: (1) the importance of the proposed continuation of the economic recovery program to the success of our over-all policy toward Korea and (2) the part which our Korean policy plays in United States policy for the Far East.

First as to Korea: You will recall that the United States has taken the leadership among the nations to attain the realization of our fundamental declaration made at Cairo in 1943 with the United Kingdom and China (and later joined by the U.S.S.R.) "that in due course Korea should become free and independent." When our own efforts to persuade the U.S.S.R. to join in holding free elections to establish a united country were unsuccessful, we referred the matter to the United Nations. The General Assembly has used and is using its best efforts to bring about the accomplishment of this end, desired by all the Korean people. The success of its efforts has, thus far, been limited to assisting in the establishment of a free government, the Republic of Korea, in what was formerly the area of United States occupation.

Upon the establishment of the Republic, the United States undertook to assist it to survive and develop as a democratic, representative government. To do this, the United States is providing

the Republic with political support. Through our information and educational programs, we are seeking to help the Republic develop a sound educational system founded on principles of representative democracy. At the request of the Republic, we are maintaining there a Military Advisory Group to assist in training Korean security forces and to insure the efficient employment of United States military assistance by those forces. Supplementing the prior transfer of military equipment under the Surplus Property Act, the Congress has authorized under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act the extension of military aid to Korea. And the Congress has recently authorized the Economic Cooperation Administration to undertake a program intended to bring the economy of the Republic as nearly as possible to a self-supporting basis. In doing so the Congress authorized the expenditure in the fiscal year 1950 of the total sum of 120 million dollars.

By means of these and related measures, the United States hopes to achieve the objective of strengthening the Republic of Korea to the point where it can (1) successfully withstand the threat of expanding Communist influence and control arising out of the existence in north Korea of an aggressive Soviet-dominated Communist regime and (2) serve as a nucleus for the eventual peaceful unification of the entire country on a democratic basis.

The testimony presented to your Committee by Mr. Hoffman, Mr. Webb, and other witnesses at the time of hearings on the bill authorizing the program for fiscal year 1950 indicated very plainly that the authority requested was to carry out the first year of a planned 3-year program intended to help Korea make substantial progress toward a self-supporting economy. The program for which authority is now requested for fiscal year 1951 is the second year of this 3-year program. Since Mr. Hoffman will go into the economics of the program with you, I will not attempt to do so beyond saying that the Department of State has partici-

¹ Made before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on Mar. 7, 1950, and released to the press on the same date.

² Mr. Webb and Mr. Hoffman are the Under Secretary of State and Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration, respectively.

pated in the preparation of the program which he will outline and supports it fully.

Second, as to the place of this proposal in our over-all Far Eastern policy, I have said that the United States is taking the leadership among the nations in helping the people of Korea attain the goal of a united independent nation, free from foreign domination. As a result of this initiative, the United States today is looked to not only by the people of Korea but by the peoples of the Far East and, in fact, by the people of democratic nations everywhere as the leader in the struggle for the survival of a Korean Republic, both for itself and as a possible nucleus for the eventual peaceful unification of that country.

Broadly speaking, the United States foreign policy in the Far East is directed toward encouraging and assisting the efforts of the peoples of that area to improve their welfare and security, to stabilize and develop their economies, to strengthen free institutions, and to advance the cause of self-government free from outside domination. Korea is one place in which the United States can continue to take well-defined positive steps to help a free democratic country to survive in the face of efforts of communism to engulf it. Hundreds of millions of people of Southern and Southeastern Asia and the islands of the Pacific are now in a period where they must choose between the roads toward democracy or totalitarianism. As the President said in his message to the Congress on Korean aid in June of last year:

Korea has become a testing ground in which the validity and practical value of the ideals and principles of democracy which the Republic is putting into practice are being matched against the practices of communism which have been imposed upon the people of north Korea. The survival and progress of the Republic toward a self-supporting, stable economy will have an immense and far-reaching influence on the people of Asia. Such progress by the young Republic will encourage the people of southern and southeastern Asia and the islands of the Pacific to resist and reject the Communist propaganda with which they are besieged. Moreover, the Korean Republic, by demonstrating the success and tenacity of democracy in resisting communism, will stand as a beacon to the people of northern Asia in resisting the control of the Communist forces which have overrun them.

The people of Asia, as well as the people of Korea, have been able to see the way in which economic assistance from the United States has contributed already to the ability of the Korean people to move toward economic independence. The Economic Assistance Program has increased agricultural production and the well-being of the large farming population of Korea. It has given food to the families of the industrial workers and, by increasing production, has brought about mounting employment. It has made possible a small surplus for export as a source of foreign exchange

with which necessities may be imported. This progress, together with the rehabilitation of factories, mines, and fishing facilities important to the Korean economy, has helped to give them faith in their form of government, strength to resist the constant pressures of communism, and confidence in their future.

There is one further and fundamental question which must be considered: That is the probability of ultimate success of the effort of the Korean Republic to survive. In recent debates, a number of Members of the Congress have indicated their feeling that the possibility of failure makes them doubt the wisdom of the United States giving a helping hand in this effort. It is my belief that American policy should be based on determination to succeed rather than on fear of the possibility of failure. Despite the problems with which the Republic of Korea is beset, both internally and externally, and despite its necessarily limited experience in self-government and paucity of technical and administrative know-how, conditions of stability and public order have continued to improve and the threat of Communist overthrow appears at least temporarily to have been contained.

There is good reason to hope from progress made thus far that with our assistance, the Republic of Korea can survive and thrive. This cannot, of course, be guaranteed. However, it continues to be true that without our assistance there can be no such hope.

Pakistan Prime Minister To Visit the United States

[Released to the press March 7]

Liaquat Ali Khan, Prime Minister of Pakistan, and his wife, the Begum Liaquat Ali Khan, upon the invitation of the President, will arrive in Washington on May 3, 1950, as guests of the United States Government.

After several days in Washington and New York, the Prime Minister and his party will depart from New York on May 10 and visit the following cities: Chicago, Illinois; Kansas City, Missouri; San Francisco, California; Los Angeles, California; Houston, Texas; New Orleans, Louisiana; Schenectady, New York; and Boston, Massachusetts, where the official trip will end on May 26.

Present plans are for the Prime Minister and his party to leave for Canada on May 30, where he will be a guest of the Canadian Government for a few days, after which he will return to New York and depart for Pakistan.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

Meeting of North Atlantic Council Called

Statement by Secretary Acheson

[Released to the press March 8]

As Chairman of the North Atlantic Council it is one of my functions to call meetings of the Council after consultation with my colleagues. We have had three such meetings thus far. I anticipate that we shall require another meeting in April or May.

As for a meeting of the three Western Foreign Ministers, it has been our desire to meet as regularly as our mutual convenience permits. I believe it possible that we may meet in late April or early May.

Foreign Governments Invited to U.S. Trade Fair

[Released to the press March 8]

The Secretary of State, under the date of March 3, 1950, transmitted to all Foreign Governments with which the United States has diplomatic relations, a letter of invitation from Adlai E. Stevenson, Governor of the State of Illinois, to participate in the First United States International Trade Fair to be held at Chicago, Illinois, August 7-19, 1950.

The invitation expressed the hope that the foreign governments would officially participate in the Fair and encourage their manufacturers, producers, and buyers to participate.

The Fair has chosen as its slogan "World Trade, World Prosperity, World Peace." The invitation to participate in this Fair is not being extended on behalf of the United States Government, nor is the Fair being held under the auspices of this Government. The State Department has expressed the hope that many nations will be represented in this first Trade Fair in the United States.

Soviets Walk Out From Meeting of ICEF Executive Board

Statement by Secretary Acheson

[Released to the press March 8]

The Soviet walkout from the meeting of the Executive Board of the International Children's Emergency Fund on March 6 conforms to a now-familiar pattern in United Nations organs. Because the U.S.S.R. cannot secure majority support for its own position on a particular issue—the question of who should represent China in United Nations organs—it refuses to participate in collective efforts to promote human welfare. Thus, the Soviet Union has again demonstrated that it regards the United Nations less as an agency to advance human well-being than as a forum to conduct propaganda for its own particular purposes.

If other United Nations members adopted the same arbitrary attitude, international cooperation would become impossible. On our part, we have stated that while we recognize the National Government as the Government of China and will vote against any attempt to unseat its delegates, we will accept the parliamentary decisions of United Nations organs on the matter.

The Soviet boycott of the activities of the United Nations Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, the Trusteeship Council, and a number of subsidiary United Nations bodies will not interfere with the evident determination of other members of the United Nations to continue the normal range of activities of the organization to the greatest possible extent. The work of the International Children's Emergency Fund on behalf of underprivileged children will be carried forward. The humanitarian efforts of the United Nations cannot be jeopardized by the propaganda activities of any member.

The Soviet action in this instance is all the more flagrant since the U.S.S.R. has never contributed any funds or materials to the Children's Fund.

United States Reports on Administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands¹

Ambassador Ernest A. Gross, acting representative of the United States at the seat of the United Nations, today announced the transmittal to the Secretary-General of the United Nations of the annual report of the United States on the administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

This second report of the United States on its administration of the trust territory will be subjected to a thoroughgoing examination by the United Nations Trusteeship Council at its seventh session scheduled to open at Lake Success in June 1950. Also, a visiting mission of the Trusteeship Council is scheduled to visit the four Pacific trust territories in April 1950 and will spend about 1 month in the United States Trust Territories. The report of this visiting mission will also be before the Trusteeship Council at its June session.

The report shows 1948 was a year of transition from preoccupation with the necessities of rehabilitation and repatriation resulting from the war to the development of a firm foundation for the political, economic, social, and educational advancement of the people in the future.

Political Affairs

Political advancement for the year is shown by the steps taken by the Marshallese people to establish representative legislative advisory bodies for the Marshall Islands, by the continued activities of the Palau Congress, and by the establishment of a legislative advisory committee, composed of indigenous representatives, to study and make recommendations with regard to legislation and political matters. This committee is intended to be the nucleus from which will evolve an independent territorial legislature. The report gives the following description of the political structure in the territory:

Subject to the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, all powers of government and jurisdiction in the Trust Territory are vested in the High Commissioner of the

Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. His principal assistant is the Deputy High Commissioner, whose headquarters are on the island of Guam. The Trust Territory is divided into four subareas, each of which is headed by a Governor (Northern Marianas, Western Carolines, Eastern Carolines, and the Marshalls). There are five Civil Administrative Districts.

The administration is based upon the indigenous governmental systems of the inhabitants. Local municipal governments are authorized to levy, collect, and expend local taxes and to make local rules. They assist in the enforcement of orders from higher authority and are required to keep records. Each local municipal government (island and/or village) has a magistrate and a treasurer, and may have other officials or a Council, if they so wish. Certain functions of local government may be exercised by a clan or family, although the primary responsibility remains with the local municipalities. It is the expressed policy of the Administering Authority to establish and foster self-governing communities and to give due weight to local customs and traditions in all general ordinances and regulations.

While the islanders perform legislative, judicial, and executive functions within the municipality, it has not yet been found feasible to provide for their participation in the wider areas of administration because of their localized loyalties, geographical isolation, and lack of experience in administration beyond the confines of the immediate community. Each municipality thus enjoys a large degree of local autonomy, including budgetary autonomy, subject only to the regulations of higher authorities with respect to the maintenance of peace and order, the enforcement of measures for health and sanitation and the implementation of general ordinances concerning trade, industry, labor and education which are essential to the well-being of the inhabitants of the Trust Territory as a whole.

Where the inhabitants have been found to be qualified to elect representatives regularly constituted elections have been held. Truk, the Palaus, Ponape and many satellite islands have held elections for the purpose of choosing their officials. Voting rights have been granted to male and female members of the community equally. The institution of democratic expression has been encouraged by the Administering Authority.

Economic Affairs

Economic advancement was assisted by cancellation of all import duties into the trust territory and by opening the waters of the territory to commercial fishing under regulations promulgated by the Deputy High Commissioner. Further economic advancement is promised by the importation of pure and crossbred cattle to improve local beef strains and by the importation of coconut

¹ Transmitted to the Secretary-General of the United Nations on Feb. 11, 1950, and released to the press by the United States Mission to the United Nations on the same date.

seed. Two additional agriculturists on the staff are directing the replanting of cocoanut plantations in war-damaged localities, supplying seed and fertilizer to the islanders with instructions for their use, and initiating programs to eliminate agricultural pests such as the voracious giant snail and destructive insects. This work is carried out largely by several agricultural experimental stations located within the territory.

Social Affairs

Social and scientific advancement in the future will be furthered by the Coordinated Investigation of Micronesian Anthropology (CIMA), which was completed in 1948. Projects of scientific investigation sponsored by the Pacific Science Board of the National Research Council, known as the Scientific Investigation of Micronesia (SIM), includes research in the fields of anthropology, medicine, and nutrition, botany, zoology (including intensive study of indigenous marine life), entomology, and geography.

Health

Perhaps the most outstanding work in the trust territory has been done in the field of public health. The U. S. S. *Whidbey*, a medical survey ship in the form of a floating clinic and laboratory, has been making a general medical survey of the population and during the year completed the processing of approximately 15,000 people. The Government has opened small tubercular sanatoria operated in conjunction with the administration dispensaries already established in each district headquarters. Instances of intestinal parasites formerly very prevalent among the people are responding to medical treatment. Medical training programs for the indigenous peoples have been instituted in the Guam Medical Center, Guam Memorial Hospital. The pictures of the graduating classes from this institution form an interesting part of the report. These graduates return to their own district medical centers for a year of practical training, and it is to be hoped that, as more of these special students graduate, the responsibility for the medical health program will gradually pass to indigenous personnel. The medical school offers a 4-year course in medicine which parallels, in a more limited though basic fashion, the standard program of medical schools in the United States. Also, the School for Dental Assistants and the School of Nursing provide 4- and 3-year programs respectively which similarly parallel programs in the United States.

The education of communities in health matters is furnished by instructing chiefs concerning the health programs of their islands, the reasons for health regulations, and the manner in which such regulations should be carried out. Responsibility is placed on the chief for carrying out the public health and sanitation programs among the people of their islands. In addition, instruction in

public health and sanitation is provided at the intermediate and teacher-training schools in the territory. All the people of the trust territory have been vaccinated against smallpox, tetanus, and typhoid fever. Prenatal, maternity, and child-health clinics are held in each district dispensary. The peoples of the trust territory receive complete medical service, including hospitalization, either free or at a very slight nominal charge. The people on the smaller islands are visited on a regular schedule by field trip vessels carrying a United States Navy medical officer and hospital corps personnel. Through liberal use of DDT, mosquitoes and flies on the smaller islands have been almost completely eradicated, and improved sanitation has practically eliminated the hookworm which used to be very prevalent as a source of native disease.

Education

The government of the territory has established a free public school system. Elementary schools located throughout the territory offer a 4-year program which soon will be expanded to cover 6 years. An intermediate school has been established in each of the four civil administration units and at Yap. In addition to the facilities provided at the medical center on Guam, the Pacific Islands Teacher-Training School, popularly known as "PITTS," opened in Truk on September 7, 1948. Mission schools have been established in all but the Saipan district. The government assists these schools by providing textbooks and general school supplies on condition that they meet the same standards as government schools. Advanced educational and vocational training has been established in those areas where teachers are available. Instruction has been given in health and public welfare programs, in vocational fields, and in seamanship. In keeping with the American tradition, equal educational opportunities are extended to both sexes. Four students have progressed sufficiently to merit higher education, two at universities in continental United States and two at Hawaii. Scholarships are granted to young people and adults who attend the district teacher-training schools, PITTS, or the technological or medical schools located in the territory or at Guam. These scholarships take the form of salaries calculated to cover living expenses, all facilities and materials of these schools being furnished free.

Budget

Budgetary receipts for the 1949 fiscal year amounted to \$367,951 from locally derived revenues, compared with \$162,573 in 1948. The United States allotted \$1,125,000 from appropriated funds as against \$1,385,000 for the previous year. Expenditures rose from \$1,307,216 in 1948 to \$1,455,620 in 1949. Most of the additional

amount went for public education, medical care, public health, and sanitation.

The report estimated locally derived revenue for 1950 at \$300,000 and allotments from United States funds at \$795,000. The territory had a "balance on hand" at the end of the 1949 fiscal year of \$305,000.

General

These Pacific islands, with a land area of 687 square miles, are scattered over an ocean area of 3 million square miles. The 53,917 inhabitants—nearly 13 percent more than in 1947—are nearly all Micronesians, but their local cultures vary considerably. The great majority, however, have ascribed Christianity.

The topography of the islands varies from low-lying coral atolls to mountainous volcanic islands. Three-fifths of the population is centered on six of these principal island units, some of them famous as crucial battlegrounds of World War II. They are Saipan, Palau, Truk, Yap, Ponape, and Majure.

In 60 years, the inhabitants have lived under

four different powers having four separate languages. Originally, Spain laid claim to them but sold them to Germany following the Spanish-American war. At the end of the First World War, Japan received a Class C mandate over the islands under the League of Nations and, in violation of the terms of the mandate, fortified them. At the end of the Second World War, the islands were administered by the United States Navy under Military Government until July 18, 1947, when the President approved the trusteeship agreement between the United States and the Security Council and, by Executive order, placed responsibility for civil administration under the Secretary of the Navy until a civilian department or agency should be designated to have permanent responsibility for the government of the area. The trusteeship agreement was approved by the Security Council on April 2, 1947.

Admiral D. C. Ramsey was High Commissioner for the territory until May 1, 1949, when he was replaced by Admiral A. W. Radford. Rear Admiral L. S. Fiske replaced Rear Admiral C. H. Wright as Deputy High Commissioner on August 25, 1948.

The United States in the United Nations

[March 11-17]

Trusteeship Council

At the request of the French and United Kingdom delegates, the Trusteeship Council agreed on March 13 to postpone until its June session consideration of all matters relating to the British and French Togolands. This action was taken in view of the announcement of the two administering authorities that they are preparing concrete proposals for a solution of the problems relating to the Ewe people, who inhabit both territories. General debate on the annual report on the Trust Territory of the British Cameroons was completed the same day, and on March 16, the Council completed general discussion of the annual report on the Trust Territory of the French Cameroons. The Council also continued its second reading of the draft statute for Jerusalem.

Security Council

Following Indian and Pakistan acceptance of the 4-power resolution on Kashmir, submitted by Cuba, Norway, the United Kingdom, and the United States on February 24, it was adopted by

the Security Council on March 14 by a vote of 8-0, with India and Yugoslavia abstaining.

Indian representative, Sir B. N. Rau, in accepting the resolution, made it clear that India still maintains its reservations with respect to the McNaughton proposals. He also affirmed that India's acceptance was based on the assumption that the Council's appointment of the United Nations representative would be with the agreement of the parties. The Pakistani representative, Sir Zafrulla Khan, reiterated Pakistan's insistence on observance of the previous agreement between the parties that the accession of Kashmir would be determined by a free and impartial plebiscite.

Draft Convention on the Declaration of Death of Missing Persons

A United Nations Conference opened at Lake Success on March 15 to discuss a draft convention on the declaration of the death of missing persons. The Conference was called by the Secretary-General in accordance with a decision of the General Assembly at its last session. In its resolution, the Assembly recognized "the importance and

urgency of the question," as well as the "legal difficulties arising, especially because of differences of legislation" as between nations. The Assembly also referred the draft convention to member states "to enable them to examine it and consider the possibility of adopting, if necessary, legislative measures on the legal status of persons missing as a result of events of war or other disturbances of peace during the postwar year until the present time."

The first meeting was attended by 26 nations. Assistant Secretary-General Ivan Kerno, in his opening statement, explained that the purpose of the draft convention was to facilitate the issuance of death declarations and provide for their recognition by other nations. After a short general discussion, the Conference began article-by-article examination of the 19-article draft convention prepared by an *Ad Hoc* Committee of the Economic and Social Council in June 1949.

International Refugee Organization

The General Council of the International Refugee Organization (Iro) began its fifth session March 14 in Geneva. At this meeting, consideration will be given to plans for reducing to a minimum the number of displaced persons who must be left in occupied areas after the termination of the Iro; solving the problem of arranging for nonresettlable refugees requiring institutional care; and finding special opportunities for highly trained refugees and others who do not fit into normal mass-migration schemes.

The Iro is scheduled to terminate its services at the end of March 1951. Its program of care and maintenance in camps throughout Europe, the Middle East, and the Far East, upon which approximately 300,000 refugees now depend, will be discontinued at the end of June 1950, except for those displaced persons actually in the process of resettlement or repatriation. A High Commissioner's Office for Refugees, authorized at the last session of the General Assembly, will be established as of January 1, 1951, to provide for the protection of refugees and displaced persons after the termination of the present organization.

International Children's Emergency Fund

The 26-nation Executive Board of the International Children's Emergency Fund met at Lake Success March 6-7. Its primary action grew out of the recommendations of its Program Committee. New allocations, totaling \$3,434,000, as recommended by the Committee, were approved for Palestine Refugees, feeding operations in Europe, additional raw materials for Germany streptomycin, Malta milk conservation, and freight.

For Latin America, the Board approved the

use of \$1,433,000 in previously allocated funds for child health projects in ten countries. These include a new program in Brazil for support and expansion of existing medical and child care programs and institutions, expansion of insect control in Central America, yaws control in the Dominican Republic, and antituberculosis campaigns in Mexico and Ecuador. Also approved was the use of \$50,000 for expansion of feeding programs in the Philippines, Malaya, Sarawak, and Brunei.

The Board agreed to the continuance of negotiations regarding the establishment of a national training center for child health workers in India, to be financed jointly by the Fund and the Government of India. Approval of the project was given with the understanding that it would be a national center, nationally administered, and available for international training programs. The Fund's contribution is not to exceed \$1,000,000.

The Board was informed that the Program Committee had approved provision of baby food processing equipment to Czechoslovakia, the cost of which is estimated at \$40,000 to \$50,000 which will be financed out of general allocation already made to Czechoslovakia. The recommendation that 1,200 tons of wheat be provided for 150,000 children in the drought areas of Bulgaria was also accepted, though some opposition was expressed. With reference to Rumania, the Board decided that no action on the use of the \$2,600,000 balance of funds previously allocated to that country be taken before the next Board meeting scheduled for June 1950. Shipments of supplies to Rumania were suspended in December 1949 until the question is settled of whether a permanent mission should be stationed there. The United States suggestion, based on precedent, that the remainder of the allocation be returned to the general reserve with the understanding that Rumania could reapply for it was not accepted.

Substantive discussion of continuing needs of children was deferred until the next session since the Secretary-General is working on a report for action by the Sixth Session of the Social Commission to convene April 3, 1950. The United States representative expressed the positive interest of her Government in this subject, suggesting certain specific considerations that should be taken into account in the preparation of the report.

The Soviet, Polish, and Czechoslovak representatives did not participate in this session. At the outset the Soviet representative asked that the representative of the "Chinese Kuamintang" be expelled, declaring that the Soviet Union would not participate or recognize any decision taken with this representative present. The Board overruled the ruling by the President (Poland) that the Soviet motion was in order, whereupon the representatives of the Soviet Union, Poland, and Czechoslovakia left the meeting.

THE FOREIGN SERVICE

U.S. Ambassadors Conclude Conference at Rio

[Released to the press March 9]

The first Regional Conference of United States Ambassadors in South America met at Rio de Janeiro, March 7-9, under the chairmanship of Edward G. Miller, Jr., Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs.

The Rio Conference, like last January's Habana Conference of Ambassadors in the Caribbean Area, represents a new practice of bringing United States diplomatic representatives together periodically to review regional problems and policies. The Ambassadors participating in this Conference agree that it has been of value in the clarification of their respective problems and of the policies bearing upon them.

The representatives of the Department of State, for their part, had the benefit of the first-hand impressions that the Ambassadors were able to supply. The role of Mr. Kennan—of relating the problems of the Western Hemisphere to the world-wide foreign policy of the United States of America—was a significant part of the Conference agenda.

The Conference began with a report from each Ambassador upon the situation in the country where he is serving. General discussion followed. Mr. Kennan outlined the world-wide problems that challenge United States foreign policy and the development of that policy to meet those problems. He dealt also with the relationship of the problems of the Western Hemisphere to conditions the world over and the consequences with respect to the United States policy in Latin America. There was agreement that the United States should continue and intensify its promotion of Inter-American solidarity and of specific measures addressed to this end.

The increasing contribution and importance of freely organized labor to the progress and stability of the Hemisphere were noted with satisfaction.

A principal item of the Conference was an extensive study of the economic problems of the American States. Special attention was given to the agenda for the forthcoming extraordinary session of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council and the means by which the United States Delegation, to be headed by Assistant Secretary Miller, might contribute to the deliberations of that body.

The Conference discussed means to intensify and accelerate economic development in the other American Republics. It noted that, while private

dollar investments in the other American Republics had increased during the past decade, most of these investments were made by petroleum and mining companies, and those investments tended to be concentrated in a small number of countries. Other new dollar investments, on the other hand, have shown a tendency to decline, and, in certain countries, such investments have virtually ceased. Economic development can be achieved, the conferees agreed, only by the balanced and coordinated application of available means, including public and private investment, the stimulation of trade, and the application of technical knowledge and skills. The Conference recognized that these factors are complementary and interdependent. It agreed that maximum development will require that local capital funds be supplemented by a substantial volume of United States private investment and the resources of the lending agencies in Washington.

The Conference had before it the text of the Point 4 bill which the House Committee on Foreign Affairs has voted to report favorably and was in agreement with the principles outlined in the bill. It recognized that the cooperation in the economic field must be a continuous process of mutual action and that the success of any economic program must depend upon the effectiveness with which each country concerned bears its measure of responsibility. In particular, the Conference felt that the device of permanent joint commissions would be useful in the preparation and development of bilateral economic programs.

The Conference gave special attention to problems arising from dollar shortages in other American Republics and felt that problems of this type also could be dealt with by these commissions.

The discussions brought out the importance of the United States policy of giving continued support to the development of the Inter-American system, especially the Organization of American States, as the prime expression of Inter-American solidarity in action.

In conclusion the Conference resolved to express its gratitude to the Government of Brazil. The friendly atmosphere of Rio de Janeiro and the hospitality of the Brazilian Government contributed to the success of the meeting and were warmly appreciated.

American Emissaries to Germany Graduate From Foreign Service Institute

Graduation exercises for the 27 "local emissaries" of the United States to Germany were held on March 3 in the Department of State Auditorium under auspices of the Department's Foreign Service Institute.

The twenty-seven young men have completed a special 3-month course given by the Institute in

order to qualify them for county-level posts in Germany as "local emissaries" of this country. They were chosen from a pool of Foreign Service candidates who already passed rigid examinations for the Service in annual nation-wide competition.

Henry A. Byroade, Director of the Bureau of German Affairs of the Department, made a brief address to the graduates. Harry C. Hawkins, Director of the Institute, presided at the ceremonies. Robert J. Barnard of St. Croix Falls, Wisconsin, acted as class spokesman.

All officers will go to Germany for service under the Office of the United States High Commissioner, John J. McCloy, who conceived the idea of this specialized training course for his local aides.

Residence Given to U.S. by Curaçao for Consul General

[Released to the press March 9]

On March 15, 1950, the Government of Curaçao, N.W.I., is deeding over to the United States of America a recently constructed residence for the American consul general in Willemstadt, Curaçao.

This handsome structure is being given to the Government and people of the United States by the Government and people of Curaçao as a token of appreciation for the assistance rendered to Curaçao by the Armed Forces of the United States during World War II. The building, known as "The President Franklin Delano Roosevelt House," is to be dedicated to the memory of President Roosevelt.

Stanley Woodward, Chief of Protocol of the Department of State, has been appointed by President Truman as the special representative of the President with the personal rank of Ambassador at this ceremony. Mr. Woodward will accept the property in the name of the Government and people of the United States. He will be accompanied on his trip by Capt. Henry C. Johnson, USN, and Robert M. Winfree, a Foreign Service officer now on duty in the Department of State.

Further Details on Closure of U.S. Missions in China

Statement by Secretary Acheson

[Released to the press March 8]

I have further details concerning the closure of our missions in Communist China which may be of interest to you.

Our Embassy office in Nanking and our con-

sulate general in Tientsin have been closed. All of the Embassy staff are now in Shanghai. All but two of our Tientsin staff have departed. These two officers will leave early next week. Four additional officers and their families have left Peiping. Consul General Clubb reports from Peiping that his staff will depart as shipping space is available between March 20 and April 9.

Plans for water transport out of Shanghai are being pushed ahead rapidly, and it is hoped that a date for the latter part of the month can be set for the evacuation from Shanghai. Because of the mining of the main channel of the Yangtze, we are arranging with the American President Lines to use three or four LST's to evacuate people down the shallower north channel which has not been mined. At the present time, over 300 Americans have applied for transportation. In addition, another 1,000 or more foreigners of other nationalities are seeking transport out of China.

The use of United States naval ships is not planned.

All of our official personnel in Shanghai have exit permits. Some of our key business personnel, however, are running into difficulties, and our consul general is doing all possible to assist them.

Examinations for Foreign Service Officer Announced

[Released to the press February 21]

The Department of State announced today that the Board of Examiners for the Foreign Service has decided to hold on September 5-8, 1950, a written examination for appointment as Foreign Service officer, Class 6.

The examination will be held at American diplomatic posts and consulates and at the following 17 Civil Service examination centers: Atlanta, Boston, Chicago, Cincinnati, Dallas, Denver, Honolulu, Los Angeles, New Orleans, New York, Philadelphia, St. Louis, St. Paul, San Francisco, San Juan, P. R., Seattle, and Washington, D.C.

Application blanks may be obtained from the Board of Examiners for the Foreign Service, Department of State, Washington 25, D. C. All applications must be received by the Board of Examiners not later than the close of business on June 30, 1950. Applicants must be at least 21 and under 31 years of age as of July 1, 1950, and must have been citizens of the United States for at least 10 years before July 1, 1950. If married, they must be married to American citizens.

Appointments as Foreign Service officer, Class 6, are made at salary levels ranging initially from \$3,630 to \$4,730 per annum according to the age, experience, and qualifications of the several candidates. The United States has Foreign Service representatives in almost every country in the

THE DEPARTMENT

Loyalty Security Board of High Competency

Statement by Under Secretary Peurifoy

[Released to the press March 10]

I have been shocked by Senator McCarthy's charges concerning the caliber and competence of the Loyalty and Security Board of the Department of State. This Board is chaired by General Conrad Snow of New Hampshire. Its members, including the chairman, were picked by me personally. I picked them not only on the basis of their unimpeachable character and high standing, both inside and outside the Department, but because they are good sound citizens from the standpoint of their thinking, judgment, and level-headedness. I don't believe that anybody need do more than look at the records of these men to satisfy himself as to their competency.

Members of Loyalty Security Board

Legal Counsel:

Allen B. Moreland

Chairman of the Board:

Conrad Edwin Snow

Alternate Members:

1. Theodore C. Achilles
2. Willard Foster Barber
3. John Oscar Bell
4. George Hayden Raynor
5. David Atholl Robertson
6. John William Sipes
7. William Pennel Snow
8. Arthur Grant Stevens

Former Members:

1. Maynard Bertram Barnes
2. James Lampton Berry
3. Belton O'Neal Bryan
4. Darrell St. Claire

Appointment of Officers

Orville C. Anderson as Director, Office of International Information, effective March 10, 1950.

William S. B. Lacy as Director, Office of Philippine and Southeast Asian Affairs, effective February 19, 1950.

Frederick E. Nolting, Jr., of the Office of Western European Affairs, detailed as Coordinator of Programs in relation to the Mutual Defense Assistance Act, effective February 23, 1950.

world, and consequently officers have the opportunity to serve in many posts during their careers.

The duties of Foreign Service officers include: negotiation with foreign officials; political reporting; economic reporting in such fields as labor, finance, transportation, and communications; commercial reporting and trade promotion; agricultural reporting; issuance of visas and passports; assistance to American shipping; protection of American citizens and property; and development of cultural and informational programs.

The written examination consists of four general examinations and three special examinations. The first three general examinations measure the ability to read English with comprehension and with reasonable speed; the breadth and accuracy of vocabulary; the ability to interpret statistical tables and graphs, to comprehend simple numerical relationships, and to make simple mathematical deductions; and the range and accuracy of factual information. The fourth general examination is a test of ability to write English. One special examination is an examination in modern languages. The candidate may select any one or two of the following languages: French, German, Portuguese, Russian, and Spanish. One special examination is an examination in the principles of economics. One special examination is an examination in government and in world history since 1776, so constructed that a candidate may, if he wishes, select questions dealing with American history and government only.

Candidates who pass the written examination are admitted to oral and physical examinations, which they must pass before they become eligible for appointment as Foreign Service officers.

Consular Offices

The American Embassy at Nanking was officially closed on March 5, 1950.

An American Embassy was established at Djakarta, effective December 27, 1949. This post was formerly a consulate general at Batavia, which name has been changed.

An American consulate was established at Surabaya, Indonesia, on February 19, 1950.

The American Foreign Service establishment at Saigon, Viet Nam, has been raised to the rank of a Legation, effective February 17, 1950.

The American consulate at Asmara, Eritrea, was re-established February 18, 1950. The consular district of Asmara will be all of Eritrea.

Italian Somaliland was transferred from the consular district of Nairobi to that of Addis Ababa, effective January 12, 1950.

The Portuguese Islands of São Tomé and Príncipe were transferred from the consular district of Lisbon, Portugal, to the consular district of Luanda, Angola, effective February 15, 1950.

Sierra Leone was transferred from the consular district of Lagos, Nigeria, to the consular district of Monrovia, Liberia, effective February 23, 1950.

March 20, 1950

Contents

General Policy

	Page
"Total Diplomacy" To Strengthen U.S. Leadership for Human Freedom. Remarks by Secretary Acheson	427
Soviet Isolation of the Russian Peoples. By Foy D. Kohler	430
Soviet Refusal To Grant Exit Permits to American Citizens in the U.S.S.R.	433
Bulgarian Militia Indicts Michael Shipkov on False Charges for Second Time. Statement by Secretary Acheson	441
Flagrant Communist Activities in Bulgaria Produced Break. Address by Donald R. Heath	442
Rumania Requested To Clarify Demands for U.S. To Discontinue Information Activities in Bucharest	443
Departments of State and Justice Recommend Deportation of Soviet Spy	445
Nonimmigrant Passport Visa Fees Waived for Portuguese	445
U.S.-Brazil Cooperation in the Conduct of International Affairs. Remarks by Assistant Secretary Edward G. Miller	446
Support of Objectives of Caribbean Commission Reaffirmed	447
Letters of Credence:	
Costa Rica	447
Panama	447
U.S. Has No Objection to Mexico's Claim to Coronados Islands	448
Continued Aid to Korea Requested. Statement by Secretary Acheson	454
Pakistan Prime Minister To Visit the United States	455

The United Nations and Specialized Agencies

Human Rights Issue Marks First U.S. International Court Appearance	444
Soviets Walk Out From Meeting of ICFE Executive Board. Statement by Secretary Acheson	456
United States Reports on Administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands	457
The United States in the United Nations	459

Treaty Information

New U.S.-Canadian Treaty on Uses of Niagara River Water	448
Tax Treaty Discussions With Uruguay	448

Treaty Information—Continued

	Page
Status of Members of the Armed Forces of the Brussels Treaty Powers.	449
Army and Air Force Mission Agreements With Honduras	453

Economic Affairs

Yugoslavia Receives Export-Import Bank Loan	445
---	-----

International Information and Cultural Affairs

Rumania Requested To Clarify Demands for U.S. To Discontinue Information Activities in Bucharest	443
Economist To Visit Mexico	445
Visit of Bolivian Gynecologist	453
Visit of Chilean Mathematician	453
Foreign Governments Invited to U.S. Trade Fair	456

National Security

Meeting of North Atlantic Council Called. Statement by Secretary Acheson	456
--	-----

The Foreign Service

U.S. Ambassadors Conclude Conference at Rio	461
American Emissaries to Germany Graduate From Foreign Service Institute	461
Residence Given to U.S. by Curaçao for Consul General	462
Further Details on Closure of U.S. Missions in China. Statement by Secretary Acheson	462
Examinations for Foreign Service Officer Announced	462
Consular Offices	463

International Organizations and Conferences

Meeting of North Atlantic Council Called. Statement by Secretary Acheson	456
--	-----

The Department

Loyalty Security Board of High Competency. Statement by Under Secretary Peurifoy	463
Appointment of Officers	463